

# CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

MONDAY, May 18, 1998

Washington Post

May 18, 1998

Pg. 1

## Clinton Asks Pakistan For Restraint

*Appeal Comes As Official Says Nuclear Test Virtually Certain*

By Dan Balz  
Washington Post  
Staff Writer

BIRMINGHAM, England, May 17—In the face of fresh indications that Pakistan is preparing for a nuclear test, President Clinton issued another urgent appeal today for that country to stand back from the brink and predicted that a show of restraint would produce economic, political and security benefits for it.

Clinton spoke shortly after Pakistani officials, including Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan, suggested that Pakistan was close to responding to a series of bomb tests by India last week and its government's declaration of itself as a nuclear weapons power. "It's a matter of when, not if, Pakistan will test," Khan said in an interview with the Associated Press. "The decision has already been taken by cabinet." Other officials said Pakistan was keeping its options open.

Leaving a meeting with

Russian President Boris Yeltsin, Clinton told reporters, "I still have hopes that the prime minister [Nawaz Sharif] and the Pakistani government will not go through with a nuclear test. And I believe that we can, the rest of us who would support that, can work with them in a way that meets their security interests without the test."

Clinton's comments came as the leaders of the major industrialized nations, known as the Group of Eight, concluded their annual meeting deeply divided over whether to impose sanctions on India, as the United States and others have done. A closing communique, while condemning the tests, contained only a vaguely worded statement saying India's relations with each of the powers "had been affected" by its testing.

In Pakistan, government sources said the G-8's failure to take stronger action against India had strengthened the hand of hard-liners in Sharif's cabinet who advocate an immediate nuclear test. The

sources said top commanders in the army, which frequently has the final say in Pakistani politics, were also pressing for action.

Pakistani Information Minister Mushadid Hussain, speaking on CBS's "Face the Nation," described the G-8 decisions on India as "just a mild slap on the wrist, which means that there's no price tag for bad behavior."

"We feel that India is getting away with it all," he added.

For a third day, the prospect of a nuclear arms race on the Indian subcontinent overshadowed the G-8's deliberations. As the leaders gathered for their final meeting this morning, there was an unconfirmed report -- later denied -- that Pakistan already had conducted a nuclear test. The leaders spent part of the meeting sharing information gleaned from their own countries in trying to determine whether the report was true.

Administration officials made clear that, after high-level talks in Islamabad, the Paki-

stani capital, on Friday, they believe they have little direct leverage on Pakistan, other than the moral suasion Clinton has been attempting since India exploded five underground tests last week.

Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, who briefed Clinton on his Islamabad talks here this morning, said the U.S. delegation left believing Pakistani officials had not made a decision about testing, but without a clear sense of what might turn them away from doing so. "They made quite clear they didn't think there was any magic wand to be waved here," Talbott said.

National security adviser Samuel R. "Sandy" Berger has hinted that there was a solution in the works to compensate Pakistan for F-16 fighters purchased in the late 1980s but never delivered because of sanctions levied in 1990.

Speaking in televised interviews in Washington, three senators said they would support release of the F-16 fighters to Pakistan if the Islamabad government refrains from its own nuclear test. The chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Richard C. Shelby

## Indian Scientists Confirm They Detonated A Hydrogen Bomb

New York Times...See Pg. 2

## Senators would like Balkan pullback

*May utilize 'power of the purse' to restrict size of force*

Washington Times...See Pg. 4

In response to Feingold criticism

## Cohen Says No Super Hornet Coverup, Wing Drop Not An Issue At DAB

Inside The Navy...See Pg. 5



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



(R-Ala.), and vice chairman, Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.), said on NBC's "Meet the Press" that there would be immediate efforts to amend the defense authorization bill to strike the long-standing restrictions on military business with Pakistan, known as the Pressler amendment, after former senator Larry Pressler.

But Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), speaking on CBS, said that releasing the F-16s -- which he supports -- was unlikely to affect Pakistan's decision.

During his television appearance, Information Minister Hussain spoke dismissively of the F-16s and Washington talk of easing the Pressler sanctions, describing them as "some goodies here and there." Hussain said three times, without elaborating, that his government sought more than a modest quid pro quo from Washington and that "our security needs are not yet being addressed fully."

Talbott told reporters that Pakistan was not approaching its decision by asking the United States or others for specific types of assistance. "They certainly didn't convey to us a wish list of things that, if we did them, they would then not test," he said. "They saw the problem in a much more both fundamental and sophisticated way than that."

Clinton again appealed to Sharif to be a statesman, despite huge internal pressures to respond to India with Pakistan's own test. "I think that over the long run, and indeed before then, the political, the economic and the security interests of Pakistan and Pakistan's standing in the world would be dramatically increased if they walked away from a test," Clinton said.

Responding to criticism that the G-8 had produced little more than rhetoric on the issue, Clinton said, "Every country condemned the Indian action,

including countries that were very close to India. And every country said their relations would be affected by it. When I came here, that's the most I thought we could get."

U.S. officials said some countries initially opposed using the word "condemn" in Friday's statement -- one measure of the wide differences among the eight nations over how to respond to the situation. The United States, Japan and Canada have announced sanctions against India; France, Britain and Russia have opposed sanctions.

Even as he tried to nudge Pakistan away from testing, Clinton and his senior foreign policy advisers expressed determination to develop a strategy to reverse the course set by India before it becomes even more dangerous to the region. Clinton pledged a concerted effort once he returns from Europe.

"The question now is how to

limit the damage that was done and how to get those two important countries on the subcontinent moving back in the same direction as much of the rest of the world," Talbott said.

Clinton's meeting with Yeltsin, the first since the Russian leader unexpectedly dismissed his cabinet and installed a new group of advisers, covered a range of issues, but the question of nuclear proliferation weighed heavily in light of events.

Clinton said developments in South Asia created "a greater sense of urgency" for Russia to ratify the START II treaty, which reduces nuclear stockpiles, and to begin negotiations on a START III treaty as part of an effort to change the proliferation debate "toward less, not more."

*Washington Post staff writer Barton Gellman, in Washington, and special correspondent Kamran Khan, in Karachi, Pakistan, contributed to this report.*

New York Times

May 18, 1998

Pg. 1

## Indian Scientists Confirm They Detonated A Hydrogen Bomb

By John F. Burns

NEW DELHI, India -- In a disclosure with potential to further accelerate a nuclear arms race with Pakistan, Indian scientists confirmed Sunday that the largest of five underground nuclear tests they conducted last week involved a hydrogen bomb, a device with potentially enormous power that is known in American military circles as a "city-buster."

When the first round of three tests was announced last Monday, India described the biggest of the weapons tested as a "thermonuclear device," a term that set off a debate among weapons experts around the world about the kind of weapon involved.

The scientists, appearing at

a news conference, gave technical details of a bomb code-named Shakti-1, after a Hindi word for power commonly used when referring to the most potent of the Hindu gods.

The scientists said that the bomb was a two-stage device involving a so-called fission trigger and a second stage that gave the bomb its main explosive force, a design they said was popularly known as a hydrogen bomb.

According to figures released by the scientists, the bomb had an explosive force equivalent to 43,000 tons of TNT. This would be small by comparison with the most destructive nuclear weapons built by the United States, Russia and other established nuclear powers, which have tested hydrogen bombs with explosive

power equivalent to several million tons of TNT.

But the Indian scientists said their weapon was deliberately kept small to avoid damage to several populated villages close to the test site in India's northwestern desert.

Dr. Rajagopal Chidambaram, chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission, said the design of the bomb gave India the capability to increase its explosive power virtually at will. "In fact, we could have got much higher yields than we got," he said. "We were limited by possible seismic damage to the villages".

Another scientist, Dr. A.J.P. Abdul Kalam, regarded as the "father" of the Indian bomb, said of the possibility of building bigger bombs, "If there is a

demand, we will do it."

"Thermonuclear device," American weapons specialists said Sunday, literally refers to a device that burns hydrogen fuel, and thus has more punch than an atom bomb, the kind of weapon the United States dropped on Japan in 1945.

But hydrogen bombs come in two varieties. In the first, the American specialists said, scientists fill the core of a small atom bomb with hydrogen fuel, a trick that can boost its power 10 times or more.

But making a true hydrogen bomb hundreds or even thousands of times more powerful requires a more complex method. In this second variety, the secret is to harness the radiation from an exploding atomic bomb and use that to compress and heat a packet of

### EARLY BIRD WEBSITE

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

hydrogen fuel that is located not internally but nearby.

It was this type of weapon that the Indian scientists described at their news conference Sunday. Chidambaram and Kalam repeatedly emphasized that the weapon they detonated involved a "fission trigger," meaning a small atom bomb that set off the main blast, and not the other type of thermonuclear weapon, which they described as a "boosted fission" device. They said they had developed designs for this type of weapon in laboratories, but did not test one last week.

In theory, the amount of hydrogen fuel ignited by the stage method has no limit. America's first hydrogen bomb, exploded in 1952, was about 700 times more forceful than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

The Pacific isle of Elugelab, one mile in diameter, where it had been located, simply vanished. But the practical considerations of putting the bomb atop a missile can quickly lead to difficulties, and it was not clear from Sunday's statements by the Indian scientists that these have been resolved.

Harold Agnew, former director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the birthplace of the bomb in New Mexico, said the Indian claim of having made a true hydrogen bomb was quite believable.

"It's not a giant step if you have smart people and understand the basics," he said in a telephone interview. "They could probably make bigger ones," he added, referring to true hydrogen bombs. "If you can do a little one, you can do big ones."

The news conference in New Delhi turned into another occasion for Indians to demonstrate their soaring pride at the nuclear tests. The scientists were applauded by Indian reporters, asked for their autographs and generally treated much like early American astronauts returning from a space mission. In their remarks, they repeatedly emphasized that they had developed the versions of the nuclear weapons tested last week on their own, without any foreign help.

But their claim that they had detonated a hydrogen bomb appeared likely to increase

tensions with Pakistan, where government officials have spent the days since the first Indian blasts weighing whether to respond with a nuclear test of their own and risk being punished with the same economic sanctions that the United States and some other nations have imposed on India, or hold off in the hope of isolating India.

For several years, Western intelligence experts have known that Pakistan had the capability to build an atomic bomb, but American nuclear experts have said it is far from clear that they could detonate a hydrogen bomb.

As India released the first technical details of its tests, Pakistani Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan was quoted Sunday as having said that it was not a question of whether Pakistan would stage a nuclear test, but when. It was unclear, however, if he was speaking on behalf of his government.

The technical details given by the Indian scientists also appeared to clear up uncertainty that developed among Western geologists and weapons experts over the number of weapons tested by the Indians, and their explosive power.

The Indians said that the four other weapons they tested, also code-named Shakti, had an explosive force equivalent to 12,000 tons and 200 tons of TNT in the case of the two weapons tested with Shakti-1 on May 11, and about 600 tons and 200 tons for those tested on May 13.

Immediately after the first Indian tests, American seismologists said they had detected only one blast, and that it appeared to be much smaller than the first Indian estimates, no bigger than 25,000 tons of TNT equivalent.

But the Indian scientists said American "confusion" over the size of the biggest blast could have come from the fact that the device known as Shakti-1 was detonated in a shaft separated by 1,100 yards from a second shaft containing another nuclear device with an explosive capacity of 12,000 tons of TNT.

The scientists said that the simultaneous triggering of the

two devices probably caused "interference" in the seismic signatures of the two blasts that misled American experts.

The scientists released a video of Monday's blasts that showed a dramatic countdown at the test site in the Thar desert of Rajasthan state, 350 miles southwest of New Delhi.

As the English-language count reached zero, a deep boom rang out across the desert, the ground shook violently and a huge cloud of dust rose into the sky over the test site, a fenced area about a third the size of a baseball field. Cheers could be heard. A chart prepared by the scientists showed that the blast occurred 5.7 seconds after 3:45 p.m., the time set for the tests.

Shots taken from a helicopter shortly afterward showed a crater that appeared to be about 70 feet deep and several hundred feet across. A tower that had been draped in camouflage netting at the center of the site had disappeared, revealing what appeared to be a concrete walkway leading into the shaft, its sides shattered and covered with a debris of netting, twisted steel and broken sandbags. What appeared to have been tin huts on the edge of the fenced area had collapsed like a deck of cards.

The scientists' remarks spoke for their pride, and India's, that a country that is one of the poorest in the world and often described as one of the most chaotic, had achieved with the nuclear tests something that only five other nations, the United States, Russia, China, Britain and France, have done.

The scientists noted that the "fissile material," or bomb fuel, was "completely indigenous," produced from nuclear reprocessing plants designed and built by Indians, and that many other systems needed to make the tests successful, including warhead designs, high-voltage triggering devices, "safety interlocks" and a command-and-control system, had all been developed by Indians, many of them in the face of an international effort to block the Indian program.

The point was made expressively by Kalam, the nuclear physicist whose official title is chief scientific adviser

to India's defense minister. Kalam is of Muslim origin, a fact that lends a special irony to his role in view of the alarm about the Indian tests in Pakistan, a nation carved out of British India in 1947 as a home for Muslims.

With long, unkempt hair that gives him the look of a cartoon research scientist, he noted that unlike several other key figures in the Indian program, he had no training in the United States or any other western country. "I'm completely indigenous," he said, beaming.

He also described India's new abilities in a jocular way that reflected the mood in India about the tests, so overwhelmingly celebratory that most Indians have hardly found time to register the potential impact of the wide-ranging economic sanctions announced by the United States, Japan and other nations.

Speaking of the Agni, a medium-range missile test-fired three times by India with a dummy warhead, Kalam said, "You give it a conventional warhead, a nuclear warhead or even a warhead full of flowers, and it will carry it."

The scientists were keen to emphasize, as Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee has, that India regards its nuclear power as defensive and that it has no plans to mount a first-strike against Pakistan or China, its potential foes.

"For 2,500 years India has never invaded anybody" Kalam said.

To laughter, he added, "But others have come here, so many others have come here," a reference to 800 years of Muslim invasions that were followed by British colonial rule.

In addition to offering new details on the tests, the scientists appeared keen to press home the message that India is now a "nuclear weapons state," in the words that Vajpayee used Friday. In an interview with India Today, a news magazine, Vajpayee said India now had "the capacity for a big bomb," but left ambiguous whether that meant that it could actually mount a nuclear strike.

Kalam and the other scientists described the tests as "the culmination" of years of efforts

to turn a crude Indian nuclear device tested in 1974 into warheads of the size, shape and explosive power required for them to be carried by Indian delivery systems. The scientists identified those as including aircraft and a group of sea-launched and surface-to-surface missiles, including the Agni, which is being developed to carry warheads up to 1,500 miles.

With the tests, Kalam said, the Indian program had reached the stage where "the weaponization is complete."

A statement issued by the scientists said they had completed "a national mission to confer the country with a capability to vacate nuclear threats," meaning that India now has a nuclear deterrent. But when asked whether India now had deliverable nuclear weapons, as opposed to war-

heads that worked in test conditions, the scientists offered no direct answer, saying Vajpayee had answered the question when he described India as a nuclear weapons state.

In light of the known difficulties that the Indians have had with the Agni, in particular, Indian nuclear experts said privately the scientists' evasiveness could mean that one or more of the warheads could be carried by an aircraft, in the manner of the two American strikes on Japan in 1945.

Alternatively, the experts said, unclear answers could mean that the scientists and Vajpayee wanted potential enemies to believe that the weapons were operational, even if they were not.

The scientists said they conducted the tests within 30 days of receiving the order from Vajpayee, the Hindu nationalist

leader who took power two months ago on a pledge to make India a nuclear weapons state.

Earlier accounts in Indian newspapers had said that Kalam and Chidambaram had met with Vajpayee on the afternoon of his swearing-in, on March 19, nearly eight weeks before the tests -- a version that made it seem that the new Indian leader would have had no time for detailed briefings on the complex issues that had deterred previous prime ministers from approving the tests over many years. The timing given by the scientists appeared to link the decision to conduct the tests to another watershed for India, the announcement by Pakistan on April 6 that it had successfully test-fired a missile called Ghauri, with a range of 1,500 miles.

Although India concluded

three test-firings of the Agni in 1994, two of which were considered failures, the Pakistan test was regarded as a provocation to India, in part because the Ghauri is named after a Muslim invader who defeated an Indian king, Prithvi, in a battle 800 years ago.

If Vajpayee ordered the Indian nuclear blasts within two or three days of the Pakistan missile test, that would have set the Indian tests for about May 8 or May 9, which the Indian scientists said Sunday had been the original target dates for the Indian blasts. They said the dates were chosen because the full moon expected on the night of May 8 to May 9 was regarded as auspicious. The tests were delayed by poor weather conditions in the area until May 11 for the first series and May 13 for the second.

# Senators would like Balkan pullback

## May utilize 'power of the purse' to restrict size of force

Washington  
Times  
May 18, 1998  
Pg. 1

By Nancy E. Roman  
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A consensus is emerging in the Senate that the United States must scale back its military mission in the Balkans, but lawmakers are grappling with how best to do it.

Last week, Senate leaders agreed to postpone a major defense bill as GOP Sens. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and John W. Warner of Virginia, together with Sen. Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia Democrat, work on proposals to scale back U.S. involvement.

Mr. Warner, who serves on the Senate Armed Services Committee, is working on a plan to require the president to submit to Congress a mission statement for the region and the projected costs.

"My own theory has been that the president should at least submit a plan for the purpose of a vote," he said. "The draft I'm working on in my pocket says he'll submit the plan by May 1, 1999."

But in the end, Mr. Warner said, "the only power Congress has is the power of the purse."

Under the plan Mr. Warner is developing, if Congress disapproved of the administration's Bosnia plans it could begin reducing funds for the mission.

He said the language would very clearly preclude the administra-

tion from using defense funds -- "or funds from anywhere else" -- for Bosnia.

Mrs. Hutchison has been working for weeks to build support for a plan that would mandate a decrease in U.S. troops from 8,900 to 2,500 over 18 months. She had built a powerful group of support including Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Senate Majority Whip Don Nickles and the entire GOP leadership.

She also is also winning a few Democrats. Mr. Byrd worked with her to draft the bill, and she said Sen. Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii has agreed to come out in support of the proposal if a few changes are made.

She said every Republican and "a good 20 Democrats" agree that something must be done to prevent an open-ended U.S. commitment in the Balkans.

The problem is finding the best way to do that.

Mrs. Hutchison said she originally tried to shrink the mission by reducing funding, but found that unworkable because of necessary exemptions for forces that defend other troops.

Mr. Warner said he would like to bring Mrs. Hutchison on as the lead sponsor of whatever proposal emerges from the committee, but

Mrs. Hutchison said it is too early to say whether she could go along.

"My first impression is that it's too far off," she said of the May 1, 1999, requirement. "The president should have a plan now."

Earlier this year, Mrs. Hutchison and other senators wrote to the president, asking him to outline the U.S. mission to the region and its projected costs.

President Clinton's reply was vague, saying the U.S. forces would withdraw once there was a stable economy, among other things, a timetable Mrs. Hutchison said is unacceptable to Republicans.

When Mr. Clinton sought congressional approval for U.S. Bosnian mission 2½ years ago, the administration assured members that the mission would last 12 months and cost just \$2 billion.

Sixteen months after that deadline, there is no end in sight. Mr. Clinton has requested another \$1.9 billion to fund the troop operation, bringing the total cost of the mission so far to nearly \$10 billion, with no date for leaving.

"People are very aware that we are on a mission in Bosnia where we don't really have a security interest," Mrs. Hutchison said. "People are aware that we look like we're trying to be the policeman of

the world."

Mr. Warner agreed with Mrs. Hutchison's assessment but felt "I would not at this time sign on" to her bill mandating a troop reduction to 2,500 by February 2000, calling the approach "too much micromanaging."

Mr. Warner said that when he discusses the future of Bosnia with colleagues, he reminds them that every two years a new Congress is elected. He also reminds them that election-year politics can drive policy decisions.

## In The Loop

By Al Kamen

### Belize Protocol: One Dish, No Silver Service

The common view of U.S. ambassadors is angular patriots in striped pants opining over the future of NATO. The reality is often different. Take Carolyn Curiel, former speech writer for Hillary Rodham Clinton and now our ambassador to Belize.

Curiel may be the first ambassador to Belize to go with the U.S. Southern Command on disaster relief training exercises in the dense jungle down there.

She was out recently with the troops, who were dressed in combat gear and boots. Curiel was wearing her sneakers as she sank a foot deep in the mud while dining on her god-awful military "Meals Ready to Eat" off the hood of a Jeep. "I don't even like bugs," she said.

They don't call it the "Mosquito Coast" for nothing.

Washington  
Post

May 18, 1998

Pg. 15

## In response to Feingold criticism

Inside the Navy

May 18, 1998

Pg. 1

### COHEN SAYS NO SUPER HORNET COVERUP, WING DROP NOT AN ISSUE AT DAB

The Navy did not cover up or withhold information about the severity of the Super Hornet flight problem known as "wing drop," Defense Secretary William Cohen told program critic Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI) recently. But Cohen's own explanation of the events leading up to the first major procurement decision for the fighter program, made during an intense internal Pentagon review of future policies and procurements, seems at odds with internal Navy reports that highlighted the phenomena as a problem that could threaten the aircraft's ability to handle a dogfight.

Seeking to quell speculation that Navy and defense officials pushed the program into low-rate production while overlooking test problems, Cohen's letter supports the Navy and the process under which aircraft manufacturer Boeing received an order to build 12 aircraft, even as test pilots were discovering the extent of wing drop.

"At no time did I feel that information was withheld from my office," Cohen told Feingold in an April 29 letter. "On the contrary, the F/A-18E/F program has been noteworthy for its open, honest and timely communications." Elsewhere in his letter, Cohen said, "Contrary to some media statements, the wing drop problem is not a safety of flight problem, and there was no coverup by the Navy."

Feingold asked Cohen to clear up questions about who knew about the severity of the "wing drop" problem heading into a March 26 meeting between senior Pentagon and Navy officials that would determine whether or not the service would award a contract to build 12 aircraft and spend money to start buying parts for another 20. Then-Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Paul Kaminski approved the aircraft purchase just two weeks after he personally lobbied Cohen, who had recently been confirmed, to move ahead with the program.

At the time, the Pentagon was deep into the Quadrennial Defense Review, a far-reaching, top-to-bottom look at strategy, structure and procurement plans. Cohen, still new to the job, said during a March 14 press conference that no major procurement decisions would be made until the review was completed in May. That same day, Kaminski sent Cohen a memo urging the secretary to "clarify" his remarks, recommending instead Cohen say no decision had been made about the program at that time.

Navy officials did not brief Kaminski on the wing drop problem, service officials say, because it was rated as a minor problem at that time.

Cohen's letter to Feingold reaffirmed this defense. "During the time period leading up to the Defense Acquisition Board, the program rated wing drop as medium risk, along with numerous other developmental and test issues. . . . The [integrating integrated product team] considered it prudent to include only high-risk items in the brief to the overarching integrated product team and the [Defense Acquisition Board]. Key performance parameters were being met and wing drop, along with all the other medium-risk items, were being routinely worked, as is normal in a flight test effort."

But Super Hornet critics point to another memo, and internal program documents, that described "wing drop" as much more than a minor problem. On March 12, two days before Kaminski urged Cohen not to hold the program back until the QDR wrapped up, a program test official wrote a critical "deficiency report" that said "wing drop" was repeatedly encountered by test pilots, and that "the presence of large, uncommanded bank angle changes in the normal maneuvering [angle of attack] range will prevent or severely restrict the performance of air-to-air tracking tasks during air-to-air combat maneuvering." The report concluded that the operational effectiveness of the aircraft, its ability to dogfight, would be compromised if the problem was not fixed.

Cohen's letter says wing drop was considered a medium risk heading into the March review, but his letter contradicts itself by saying the problem was not fully discovered and rated until late summer, long after the review. "It was during the last summer of 1997 that wing drop was fully characterized," according to Cohen's letter. "During this period, the program office's internal engineering assessment, as described in the program's technical issues briefs, was that wing drop was a medium risk issue. The program risk advisory board, an internal program management tool, also rated the risk as medium."

Later in the letter, Cohen again contradicts earlier statements by saying the issue was low risk heading into the

Kaminski meeting, not medium risk.

Cohen's letter does not mention the March 12 warning report nor does it explain why it was ignored, but a May 8 statement issued by Feingold does mention it, as well as an early February report.

"An official Navy deficiency report from February 1997 classified wing drop as a '\*\*1 deficiency'. . . . In the same report, the Super Hornet's test director stated that wing drop 'will prevent or severely restrict the performance of air-to-air tracking tasks during air-to-air combat maneuvering. Therefore, the operational effectiveness will be compromised.' On March 12, 1997, the test team characterized the problem as being an unacceptable deficiency."

Feingold's statement notes that in December "wing drop" was escalated by program officials to a high-risk problem. By then, the news about the malady was being reported in the press regularly, and the Navy was reviewing a multitude of different options to fix it.

Briefing material for an internal Navy meeting preceding the March meeting with Kaminski initially contained a note about "wing drop" and other deficiencies, but was edited before it reached Kaminski.

The Navy and Cohen now say wing drop is resolved and that the "porous wing fold fairing," a wing modification to reduce the problem, will not negatively affect the performance of the aircraft. But intense operational evaluation of the program is not slated to begin until next year, and critics of the program say by then it will be too late to halt production, if needed, and that it will be costly to fix already purchased aircraft if the porous fairing doesn't alleviate wing drop.

To date, neither the Navy nor the Defense Department has agreed to release independent assessments of the wing drop fix that were conducted by the Navy's operational test force and the Pentagon's director of operational test and evaluation, both of which were the basis of the recent decision by Cohen to release full funding for the service's 20 aircraft in fiscal year 1998.

"The wing drop issue, that you expressed as the most troubling F/A-18E/F deficiency and described as program threatening, is a typical anomaly discovered and corrected during any high performance aircraft development program," Cohen told Feingold. "The size, shape, depth, number, and placement of the apertures in the porous section have been varied in order to achieve the most favorable design, but wing drop is no longer a problem. The final design will allow the aircraft to meet all performance requirements."

Feingold, who offered an amendment last year to cancel the program that was subsequently defeated on the floor of the Senate, has vowed to continue his inquiries into the program. "I am disappointed that the Defense Department has chosen to sweep all these concerns under the rug and to happily conclude that the plan is worth every penny of its \$73 million per plane price tag," Feingold said in a May 8 statement. -- *Roman Schweizer*

New York Times May 18, 1998

## Clinton Presses Yeltsin On Start II Ratification

By Richard W. Stevenson

BIRMINGHAM, England -- President Clinton urged Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Sunday to press for the ratification of a pending nuclear weapons treaty even as the United States and its allies searched for ways to head off a nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan.

On his final day of meetings here with the leaders of the six other major industrial democracies and Russia, Clinton drew a link between American efforts to continue reducing the stores of nuclear weapons held by the former Cold War antagonists and attempts to halt the spread of nuclear ability to other nations.

Throughout the day, the leaders awaited word -- sometimes exchanging conflicting reports -- as to whether Pakistan had detonated a nuclear device or made a decision to do

so in response to the nuclear tests conducted last week by India, its neighbor and rival.

Having failed to win broad support for economic sanctions of the type the United States is imposing on India, Clinton turned Sunday to a strategy of branding India -- and Pakistan too, if it went ahead with testing -- as swimming against the currents of history.

At a 45-minute, one-on-one session Sunday morning, Clinton told Yeltsin that he would like to hold a summit meeting in Moscow this year to discuss further arms-reduction talks between the United States and Russia, but suggested that Washington would first like to see the Russian Parliament ratify the pending arms reduction treaty, known as Start II.

Yeltsin and former President George Bush signed the treaty in 1993, and it was approved by the U.S. Senate in 1996, but it has become sty-

mied in the Russian Parliament.

Ratification of Start II and the beginning of negotiations on Start III, Clinton said, would send a signal to budding nuclear powers like India and Pakistan that they were moving backwards while the rest of the world was moving ahead.

Any escalation in nuclear weapons development would be a "terrible signal" at a time "when the Russians and we are doing our very best to put everything in the opposite direction and to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world," Clinton told reporters after meeting with Yeltsin.

Clinton warned against seeing nuclear weapons ability as "the new measure of either national security or national greatness," a remark that seemed intended in part as a swipe at the pride displayed in India after the tests and in part as a plea to Pakistan's government not to give in to intense domestic political pressure to match India's test.

In an interview with the BBC, Clinton suggested that the industrialized nations could have done more to encourage

India along a path of peaceful economic development, and he warned that an unchecked arms race on the Indian subcontinent could eventually draw bigger powers into conflict.

"Have we failed to acknowledge India, the incredible achievement of maintaining 50 years of democracy under the most adverse conceivable circumstances?" Clinton said. "Probably."

"But the answer is not for India to become a nuclear power and then for Pakistan to match it stride for stride, and then for China to be brought in to support the Pakistanis and move troops to the Indian border, and then for Russia to come in and recreate in a different context the conflicts of the Cold War," Clinton said. "It is a nutty way to go."

Aides said Clinton pressed Yeltsin on a number of issues, including Russia's transfer of missile technology to Iran. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, who was present at the meeting, said Yeltsin "reaffirmed in the clearest and most unambiguous terms" his commitment to cutting off the

flow of missile technology to Iran.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, who played host here to Clinton, Yeltsin and the leaders of France, Germany, Italy, Canada and Japan, said the gathering had been "both concerned and frustrated" by the growing tensions between India and Pakistan.

Blair said there was a consensus that the best path was to persuade India not to conduct any further tests and to join the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Blair said he had spoken to Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee on Friday, and that Vajpayee had told him India would promptly "begin discussions" about signing the treaty.

Clinton said that Pakistan would do better in the eyes of the world not to go ahead with nuclear testing. There would be "specific political, economic

and security benefits to the country if it does not test," Clinton said.

Clinton did not cite any specific examples. But for the last few days White House officials here have held out the possibility that the United States might be willing to resolve a longstanding dispute with Pakistan over 28 F-16 fighter jets.

Pakistan paid \$658 million for the planes, but delivery was blocked by Bush under a law that barred military sales to nations with nuclear programs. Pakistan was refunded \$157 million, but the return of the rest of the money has been blocked by Congress.

Mushahid Hussain, the Pakistani information minister, told CNN in an interview Sunday that resolving the F-16 issue would be like giving aspirin to a cancer patient and that the proposal "is not the

answer" to Pakistan's security concerns.

Hussain also criticized the leaders meeting in Birmingham for not taking a harder line against India by adopting tough sanctions. Aside from the United States, only Japan and Canada among the major industrial countries have taken any steps to halt aid payments or impose other economic penalties on India.

"It shows there is no price tag for bad behavior," Hussain said.

The leaders of the so-called G-8 countries ranged across a broad array of issues during their three days in this industrial city in the English midlands. The final session Sunday morning featured a continuation of a discussion on Saturday about preparedness for the software problems that will be caused when computers reset their calendars for the year

2000.

Blair also used Clinton's presence to help rally support for the peace plan that will be put before voters in Ireland and Northern Ireland on Friday. And in their final communique Sunday, the leaders gave their approval to a host of initiatives, some as specific as a stepped-up fight against malaria and others as general as support for restoring financial stability to Asia.

"It was a very stimulating, interesting meeting that will actually have an impact on the lives of the people that we all represent," Clinton said.

This weekend's meeting was the first at which Yeltsin and Russia were accorded the status of full participants, a milestone that Clinton marked at the beginning of their session Sunday by removing his G-8 lapel pin and pinning it to Yeltsin's suit jacket.

Washington Post

May 18, 1998

Pg. 13

## Decision On Nuclear Testing Poses Dilemma For Pakistan

By Steven Mufson  
Washington Post  
Foreign Service

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan—In her air-conditioned sitting room, with its rich carpet, carved octagonal side tables and fine drawings of historical scenes, Pakistan's former ambassador to the United States smoked a cigarette and talked about nuclear explosions that possess greater destructive force than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

"Pakistan doesn't have a choice," said Moleeha Lodhi, arguing that Pakistan must detonate its own nuclear device to respond to last week's five nuclear tests by arch-rival India. "A nuclear challenge can only be countered by a nuclear counter-response."

That counter-response could be swift. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif told ruling Muslim League party workers in Lahore yesterday that Pakistan could prepare a nuclear test within "12 to 26 hours."

For a time, it seemed as if Pakistan had already set one off. German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, in Birmingham, England, for the Group of Eight meeting, said yesterday

that Pakistan had just conducted a nuclear test. The Pakistani government vigorously denied that report.

"It is only a matter of time," Pakistan's Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan told the BBC Saturday, adding to the confusion and international concern. Khan said the cabinet had approved a nuclear test blast, but the Foreign Ministry and Sharif's office said the government is keeping its options open.

In the wake of the G-8's failure to agree on concrete sanctions to go along with its condemnation of India's tests and stated intention to deploy nuclear weapons, the domestic political pressure on Pakistani leader Sharif to press the nuclear test button is mounting -- despite the potentially dire economic consequences of sanctions that would probably follow a Pakistani test.

"It's a very, very difficult choice," said retired Lt. Gen. Talat Masood, formerly in charge of Pakistan's defense production industries. "It's a no-win situation either way."

The forces pushing Sharif to go ahead with a test include factions of his party, virtually the entire political opposition,

Muslim fundamentalists and militant students. His predecessor, Benazir Bhutto, has advocated a nuclear test, and even his own outspoken foreign minister seems to favor one.

"I wish there was another road for us, but there isn't," former ambassador Lodhi said.

Though Sharif's political alliance controls two-thirds of the seats in the parliament, the prime minister hesitates to defy popular opinion. One analyst noted that Sharif's parliamentary majority came in an election with a low voter turnout of about 35 percent.

Yet beneath the surface, there is still widespread disagreement among Pakistanis about key issues, such as nuclear deterrence, the role of the United States and the link between the economy and security.

When it comes to deterrence, many advocates of a Pakistani nuclear test view the Cold War as a model. Faced with a hostile neighbor with five times the territory, eight times the population, more than twice as many soldiers and perhaps a small nuclear arsenal, many influential Pakistanis long for a nuclear standoff with India that will be tense but

peaceful.

Only by exploding a nuclear device and establishing the fact that nuclear aggression will ensure mutual destruction can Pakistan guarantee its own security, say many opinion leaders here. To do otherwise would be a sign of weakness or inability, they say.

Yet other analysts are not certain whether a nuclear test is really needed to deter India from possible aggression. Masood, the retired officer, argues that the mere capability of performing a test is sufficient because Pakistan could always hold its test in India -- above ground.

Open testing could lead to more development and deployment. "An arms race will only make things more insecure rather than more secure," Masood said. Unlike the Soviet Union and the United States, Pakistan and India border on one another, have a territorial dispute and often have emotional leaders. "It's a very combustible material," Masood said.

Both sides of this argument agree, however, that the era of nuclear ambiguity -- which the United States valued -- is over. Masood said that Pakistan has had at least crude nuclear capability for six or seven years and that India should know

that.

Nuclear ambiguity had its virtue. The mere likelihood of nuclear weapons capability helped restrain aggression in South Asia. But now, Lodhi said, "one side has taken off the nuclear veil."

There are also mixed viewpoints concerning the fragility of Pakistan's economy and its vulnerability to international pressure. The finance minister has noted that inflows of foreign capital are keeping Pakistan from defaulting on its international loans. Pakistan's military is as eager as anyone to avoid an economic setback.

"The military understands the importance of a strong economy and an industrial base capable of sustaining its armed forces," Masood said. If Pakistan goes ahead with a nuclear test and suffers from economic sanctions, that will hurt the military's ability to get educated, skilled soldiers, re-

placement parts and new equipment and technology.

At the same time, however, Pakistanis don't want to barter their perceived national security interests for commercial ones. Moreover, they say it is unfair that India, because of its insular economy, might be better able to withstand any sanctions that are imposed for testing nuclear devices.

Finally, the role of the United States arouses divided emotions.

Pakistan's leaders are upset that the United States tried to play down the danger of India's Hindu nationalist government making good on its campaign pledge to carry out new nuclear tests. Many suspected, at least initially, that the United States deliberately looked the other way when India set off its blasts.

And yet the United States is now clearly leading the campaign for international economic sanctions against India.

stration convinced that India had no plans to explode a nuclear device, the satellites were snapping photos of Pokhran only once every six to 24 hours. Indian scientists, who knew the satellites' schedule, concealed their preparations so the photos CIA analysts scanned in the weeks before Monday's blasts showed what appeared to be routine maintenance.

Satellite photos taken of the site six hours before the blasts finally revealed clear evidence of the preparations. They were beamed back to the National Imagery and Mapping Agency in Fairfax, Va. But the agency was on a routine schedule for processing photos from India. Congressional investigators will now probe whether that Pentagon agency was paying too much attention to foreign military bases instead of political targets like India. CIA photo analysts got their first glimpse of the incriminating shots when they strolled into work Monday morning. By the time they delivered their first report that Pokhran was being prepared for a test, the Indian government had already announced the detonations.

London Times

May 18, 1998

## Beijing Expected To Review Military Options

From James Pringle  
in Beijing

INDIA'S surprise five underground nuclear tests and Delhi's description of China as its chief security threat have injected an unpredictable new degree of instability into an Asia shaken by a severe economic downturn and serious unrest in Indonesia, diplomats here said yesterday.

"Now suddenly the world's two most populous states are involved in a dramatic new security situation," said one Beijing-based analyst. China has 1.2 billion people and India, 950 million.

Until now China regarded the Taiwan Strait as its most serious security concern, though the Korean peninsula, with North Korea again hinting it may restart its nuclear programme, was a potential problem. "China has been startled by the developments and will have to begin a whole new review of its military options," said one Asian envoy. "The

danger is that a nuclear-test contagion will spread and develop into a new regional arms race."

There is concern that Beijing, which signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996 after completing a much-criticised series of underground nuclear tests, will think again and resume underground explosions.

China defeated India in a brief 1962 border war, a debacle that caused deep wounds to India's self-esteem from which it is only now recovering. Yet in recent years India and China had agreed to set aside border disputes and get on with normalising economic ties. Warnings given by George Fernandes, India's Defence Minister, that his country's main potential threat was China, not Muslim Pakistan, have caused shockwaves here. "This normalisation process now seems at risk," said one analyst.

Diplomats say the tests, possibly timed deliberately, have altered the background to President Clinton's Beijing visit next month. One Asian expert said: "India will be the absent guest at the Sino-American summit."

Time

May 25, 1998

## Why The Sky Spies Missed The Desert Blasts

By Douglas Waller  
Washington

The two \$1 billion-apiece KH-12 satellites the Pentagon has in orbit are like Hubble space telescopes pointed back to earth. From 164 miles up, their optical sensors can snap clear photographs of objects no larger than a paperback novel on the ground. The two Lacrosse satellites, same price tag, with solar-power panels that stretch the length of half a football field, have radar-imaging cameras that can see through clouds and even the dust storms that swirl around India's Pokhran test site. In a crisis, at least one of the four birds can be positioned over a target 24 hours a day, sending photos that can be on the President's desk within an hour.

But the fast service doesn't happen "if your consumers aren't asking for it," says John Pike, an intelligence analyst at the Federation of American Scientists. With the Admini-

Washington Post

May 17, 1998

Pg. 13

## Too Few Black Commanders, Cohen Says

Reuters

NORFOLK, May 16—Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, marking the 50th year since the desegregation of the U.S. military, said today that there were still too few black commanding officers in the armed forces.

Speaking to ROTC cadets at predominantly black Norfolk State University in Norfolk, Va., Cohen called the U.S. military "one of the most racially integrated institutions in America." But he said it would still take years to increase the number of black generals and admirals.

"We are right to recognize

that it takes a decade or more to develop military leaders," Cohen said. "We cannot have more African American generals and admirals simply by wishing it were so."

Last week, a Pentagon spokesman said a study had been ordered to determine why the Army's promotion rate to colonel for white officers was double that of blacks this year.

Cohen acknowledged that pockets of prejudice and even racial hate groups existed within the military. But he said the Pentagon was committed to moving swiftly and decisively against bigotry when it comes to light.

"Those who seek to make others unwelcome because of their racial or ethnic background must know it is they who are unwelcome in America's military," Cohen said in a ceremony to commission 29 Norfolk State ROTC cadets.

## Indonesian Generals' Rivalry May Play Pivotal Role

By Mark Landler

JAKARTA, Indonesia -- When Indonesia's first president, Sukarno, was ousted in the winter of 1966, the message was delivered by an obscure major general named Suharto. Now, if Suharto is forced to resign as Indonesia's president, the message may once again be delivered by a general. And that man could well become the next president of Indonesia.

Small wonder, then, that analysts here are sizing up Indonesia's top brass like candidates in an election campaign.

Most of the attention so far has focused on Gen. Wiranto, the defense minister and armed forces commander, and Lt. Gen. Prabowo Subianto, head of the Army Strategic Reserves.

Similar in age, career path, and training, the men represent the younger, more politically sophisticated generation of soldiers that have taken control of the armed forces in the last few years. But Wiranto, 52, and Prabowo, 47, have sharply different personalities -- a difference that could have profound consequences for Indonesia if either man emerges as Suharto's heir.

Wiranto, the elder of the two, is regarded as a cautious, moderate soldier, who is struggling to square his loyalty to Suharto with his sympathy for the student movement and its call for political reform. He has been the principal liaison between the army and the students, assuring them that the military supports the reform movement, albeit at a measured pace.

"Wiranto is the best guy to have in the position of running the military during these times," said one Western diplomat.

Prabowo, by contrast, is tough-talking and unpredictable, with a swaggering style typical of the Kopassus regiment, an elite corps that he commanded until earlier this year. He is also married to one of Suharto's daughters, Siti Hedijanti Herijadhi, a tie that has helped his rise but could just as easily derail him if Su-

harto is overthrown.

"Wiranto represents the institution of the army, while Prabowo is the man who gets things done," said Harold Crouch, a senior fellow at the Australian National University in Canberra who is an expert on the Indonesian military.

In Indonesia, the army functions both as a military and as a political force. As a result, Indonesia's top military officers behave a lot like politicians. In the three days since riots engulfed Jakarta, Wiranto and Maj. Gen. Sjafrie Syamsuddin, the city's military commander, have appeared on television several times to try to calm the public.

Prabowo appeared on television as well, but in a characteristically different context. He was rebutting reports of a rift between himself and Wiranto.

"It is only an issue created to look as if there is a division within the armed forces," Prabowo said in an interview televised on Friday, a day after the riots.

Rumors of a split are not new -- the two men have always been rivals -- but they surfaced again after the shooting of six students by security forces at a Jakarta university last week. Wiranto initially denied the army had used live ammunition, but later acknowledged there was evidence that real bullets had been fired. He has ordered an investigation and promised to punish any soldiers who are found to have used live ammunition.

The security forces who fired on the students were under the command of Prabowo, which has spawned rumors that he may have played a role in a decision to use real bullets. Prabowo has not addressed the issue, and there is no evidence to suggest he was involved.

It is not the first time that Prabowo has been suspected of conducting freelance military operations. In 1991, the Indonesian army carried out a campaign of intimidation against protesters and dissidents in East Timor, the former Dutch colony that was invaded by Indonesia in 1975 and annexed the following year. Several mili-

tary analysts believe that Prabowo instigated the campaign -- though again, a link was never proved.

Prabowo's impulsive nature worries some former Indonesian army officers, who said they felt more comfortable with Wiranto in charge.

"It's better to have Wiranto than Prabowo; Prabowo is too young," said Kemal Idris, a retired lieutenant general who once commanded the Army Strategic Reserves, which are now led by Prabowo.

Wiranto rose up the chain of command in relative obscurity. Idris said that Wiranto was in his unit as a young officer in the late 1960s, but that he did not remember him. But Wiranto was also an aide-de-camp to Suharto, and he won the trust of the president.

In fact, Wiranto has some of the same characteristics of the young Suharto in the 1960s. Like Wiranto, Suharto was a moderate, almost bland, army bureaucrat. He also reached out to students who at that time were protesting against Sukarno. After isolating Sukarno, Suharto moved against him in what was essentially a ritualized coup.

Whatever the parallels, Wiranto and Prabowo are both in a highly risky position, according to analysts. Suharto is a skilled political tactician who pits officers against each other. He also does not hesitate to dismiss those he deems insuf-

ficiently loyal. In 1994, Suharto dismissed his brother-in-law, Wismoyo Arismunandar, as army chief of staff.

With Indonesia on the brink of chaos, analysts said, Wiranto and Prabowo must walk a fine line of showing loyalty to their leader while preparing for a future without him.

For Prabowo, the challenge is to carve out a power base independent of the Suharto family. As head of the Army Strategic Reserves and former head of the Special Forces, he has commanded more than 30,000 of Indonesia's best troops. All told, the country has 400,000 people in uniform, but many of those are in provincial jobs and see little active duty.

Wiranto is in an equally delicate position. He is the key link between the government and the surging anti-Suharto movement. But Suharto has announced he plans to shuffle his Cabinet. Rumors swept the capital today that Wiranto would be dismissed.

Such a development would alarm Western diplomats and would be a potentially crushing setback for the students. Analysts said that if Prabowo replaced Wiranto, the army could easily switch from reaching out to the students to cracking down on them, as happened in China in 1989.

"If Wiranto were to go, it would raise serious questions about the reform movement," said Umar Juoro, an analyst at the Center for Information and Development Studies in Jakarta. "He's playing a very significant role."

Wall Street Journal May 18, 1998 Pg. 19

## As Indonesia's President Resists Change, Others Wait In Wings To Unseat Suharto

By Jay Solomon  
Staff Reporter of the  
Wall Street Journal

JAKARTA, Indonesia -- President Suharto himself might be resisting change, but Indonesia and the world continue to focus on identifying his successor.

Mr. Suharto has steadfastly refused to groom an heir, leaving no obvious candidate to succeed him. Although constitutionally Vice President B.J.

Habibie is a heartbeat from the presidency, few analysts see him as anything more than an interim incumbent.

A list of potential successors is inherently risky as Indonesia's high level of political uncertainty increases the chance that an obscure figure might emerge in a powerful position. In 1964 virtually no one would have picked then little-known Gen. Suharto as a possible successor to founding President Sukarno. Still, here are some

personalities who may be possible candidates:

GEN. WIRANTO, 51 years old, the commander of the armed forces, and the man seen holding the widest support among the officers' corps. His moderate stance toward student protesters in recent weeks has also garnered him admirers among the opposition camp. Gen. Wiranto has stated that the military ultimately seeks to have a civilian in power. Subsequently, his ascension to the top post is likely to be short term, or as part of a wider governing body.

EMIL SALIM, 67, a former minister of the environment, and a technocrat active in supporting political change. His campaign for the vice presidency in March was seen as having the support of elements

within the military as well as the students. His stature as an academic and economist would also make him attractive to foreign investors. He could serve as interim president with the military's support ahead of a general election, allowing him to push through many economic reforms needed for recovery.

AMIEN RAIS, 55, the leader of Muhammadiyah, Indonesia's second-largest Islamic organization, and the most outspoken critic of the Suharto regime. Mr. Rais has broad-based support among the rural masses and has served as a lightning rod through which student protesters garnered strength for their movements. He is also seen as having supporters in the military who have tacitly supported his critical stance against the government.

Mr. Rais' Muslim power base -- and nationalist rhetoric -- however, are seen as potentially unnerving foreign investors and detracting from his appeal for serving in any short-term, power-sharing body. If and when general elections are held, however, his popular appeal and aggressive campaigning could make him a front-runner.

MEGAWATI SUKARNOPUTRI, 51, the pro-democracy leader and daughter of Indonesia's first president, Sukarno. Following a speech last January openly declaring her willingness to be president, Ms. Megawati has largely disappeared from the political fray -- guardedly calling for political change, but resisting the strong calls offered by figures such as Mr. Rais. Her wide-scale support among the masses, how-

ever, could put pressure on the military to allow her to serve in a shared power structure.

She could emerge as a rival to Mr. Rais. Even within the past week, rifts appeared to form between her and Mr. Rais, as they signed on to separate organizations seeking Mr. Suharto's removal. She isn't seen as having widespread support in the military.

LT. GEN. PRABOWO SUBIANTO, 47, commander of the army's Strategic Reserve, and son-in-law of President Suharto. He is considered a rival of Gen. Wiranto's. Fears remain that he could launch a move within the military to take power. He isn't seen to have wide-scale support among the officers' corps but does command support among the army's powerful special forces unit.

## Californian to be named Army chief

Washington  
Times  
May 16, 1998  
Pg. 2

By Lisa Hoffman  
and John Brinkley  
SCRIPPS HOWARD NEWS SERVICE

The White House has chosen a former California state legislator and West Point graduate to be the next secretary of the Army, according to sources familiar with the selection.

President Clinton is expected to announce soon that he will nominate Louis Caldera, now managing director and chief operating officer of the Corporation for National

Service, to head the nation's largest military branch.

Mr. Caldera, 42, a lawyer and a Democrat, left his seat in the California legislature last June for the No. 2 post at CNS, a government agency that oversees domestic volunteer service programs such as VISTA.

A native of El Paso, Texas, and the son of Mexican immigrants, Mr. Caldera advocated gun control in the legislature and was author of a law requiring children to wear bicycle helmets.

After graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1978, Mr. Caldera served in the Army for five years at Fort Dix, N.J. He left the service with the rank of captain and later served in the Army reserve.

If confirmed by the Senate, Mr. Caldera would take over the Army at a time when the service is wrestling with controversies ranging from sexual harassment to the training of female recruits.

Mr. Caldera's office said he declined to comment.

Defense Week

May 18, 1998

Pg. 1

### Top Marine Advocates New Big-Deck Amphib Current Ones Potentially Unstable

By John Donnelly

The Marine Corps commandant, in an unpublished letter to the Senate's top Republican, has argued that the U.S. should start building several new big deck amphibious ships rather than extend the lives of the older ones now in the fleet.

Gen. Chuck Krulak, in a recent letter to Sen. Trent Lott (R-Miss.), says building five new, modified Wasp-class

ships (LHDs) is "a wiser investment for our nation" than putting money into improving the same number of older Tarawa-class (LHA) vessels. At issue are the "little aircraft carriers" from which Marines go ashore.

Krulak has stepped out ahead of the Navy in advocating this course. He says the modified LHDs would be more capable than the older LHAs. But *Defense Week* has learned

another reason why the LHAs are considered by some to be obsolete.

If flooded by damage from a torpedo or a mine, the 40,000-ton ships, with a crew of nearly 3,000, are not as able as they once were to right themselves. In fact, they now exceed the standard for with-standing such flooding, according to officials and documents. And the problem could be worsened by the coming deployment of MV-22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft, which outweigh the CH-46 helicopters they'll replace by 150 tons.

This is a safety and survivability issue, but a manageable one, Navy officials say. And

the ships are operationally capable. The question is whether paying for structural changes to solve this problem and others to extend the LHAs' lives is worth it. Buying a new, modified version of the LHDs will cost a bit more for an already cash-strapped Navy, but they'll last longer and be more capable, some argue.

The question is shaping up as one of the most important Navy shipbuilding issues of the year.

Officially, the Navy is still deciding whether to begin a "service life extension program" on the older LHAs. But Congress last week pushed the debate ahead. Both the House

and Senate fiscal 1999 defense authorization bills contain advanced procurement funding for the new ships, which would cost \$1.5 billion a copy. They would be built by Litton Ingalls in Pascagoula, Miss., Lott's hometown.

Back in December 1996, Lott made no secret of his displeasure with the Navy's award of a multibillion-dollar deal for a brand new, futuristic class of amphibious, the LPD-17, to Avondale of Louisiana. Building a new ship might be one way to keep the influential Lott happy.

#### Top Marine weighs in

Krulak, in a March 20 letter to Lott, wrote: "In short, it [the 'new LHD'] will carry more tanks, aircraft, amphibious assault vehicles and LCACs [Landing Craft Air Cushions] than it's LHA predecessor.

"Early projections of the cost of an LHA service life extension program (SLEP) range from \$800 million to \$1.2 billion," Krulak said. "For an additional 20 to 40 percent in cost, our nation would get a much more capable LHD that would complement our forward presence forces for 40 years, as opposed to the 15-20 years gained with a SLEP."

For its part, the Navy says it has asked the Center for Naval Analysis to review the options, which could also include a brand new class of carrier, the LH(X), to replace the first of the LHAs when their lives, unless extended, would end starting in 2011. But the LH(X) option means production money would come later, rather than sooner, and sooner is always more politically virtuous. The first of the new, modified LH(X)s would be delivered in 2004, or seven years before the first LHA would retire.

Another reason being floated for buying more LH(X)s now is that come 2011, the Navy will be paying bills to replace a host of assets whose lives will be ending.

#### Stability

Asked about the safety implications for embarked Marines in a statement Friday, Marine Corps headquarters said that "the Navy is more than capable of addressing the stability and safety issues con-

fronting LHA in an appropriate manner."

The five-ship LHA class was designed in 1962 and the first one was delivered in 1976. A lot has changed since then, such as more Marine Corps aircraft, heavier gear, ship self-defense systems and more mundane modifications such as layers of heavy paint. The effect of those changes: the 1,000 pound margin for weight growth and the six inches the center of gravity could be safely raised have both been consumed and then exceeded.

An internal Navy budget document prepared as part of the fiscal 2000 budget process stated: "The LHA-1 class can only withstand flooding of two subdivisions, vice Navy standard of three....Topside weight growth worsens the problem—12 MV-22s are 150 tons heavier than 12 CH-46."

In the event of damage, the ship is not supposed to list more than 15 degrees, the angle past which pumps stop working and firehoses and other equipment can't be operated on the deck, said Rear Adm. David Sargent, the program executive officer for expeditionary warfare at Naval Sea Systems Command.

To avert that situation, the ship was designed to withstand flooding of 15 percent of her length, or 150 of her 850 feet, without tipping over. Now, at least in certain parts of the ship, the amount that can flood, before tipping becomes more of a risk, is down to just 100 feet.

And, according to the budget document, the LH(X)s are "also nearing the three-subdivision flooding limit."

The Navy conducts a literal balancing act to make this work, though Sargent responds that such work is part of the routine of commanding a ship.

The Navy has even equipped the ships with special software to "assist the commanding officer in making rapid stability calculations and damage control responses in the event of an emergency," the service said in a statement.

In addition, each ship commander has ways to mitigate the risk. Heavier vehicles can be stored lower on the ship. Fuel tanks are emptied in a sequence that won't upset the balance. Inactive airplanes are

put in the hangars so they don't add to the topside weight.

One key reason for the heightened center of gravity is environmental rules forbidding in many areas "dirty ballasting"—filling fuel tanks with salt water to stabilize the ship.

The net result of all this is that the "center of gravity is 5 feet over the damage control standard to be able to withstand flooding of three subdivisions," said the budget document.

Navy officials emphasize that in a high-threat environment, dirty ballasting and other

extreme measures would be taken. But the Navy clearly has little margin for error in the event of serious damage.

Some say the MV-22s, with a combat weight of 42,000 pounds, are too heavy to be even be put on the decks, but the Navy denies that.

"If uncompensated," the service statement said, "the additional weight of MV-22s would raise the center of gravity three inches, however, the Navy maintains a configuration control process to compensate for this increase."

USA Today

May 18, 1998

Pg. 4

# Gulf illnesses may be based in vets' genes

By John Hanchette  
Gannett News Service

ATLANTA — Genetic researchers say they have made progress in human cell research that may help explain why more than 100,000 Gulf War veterans have complained of chronic illnesses since 1991.

California scientist Howard Urnovitz will tell the annual meeting of the American Society for Microbiology today that chromosome damage linked with exposure to environmental toxins helps explain the illnesses.

Molecular biologists use the term "genotoxic exposure" to describe human contact with cell-damaging toxins like those possibly encountered in the gulf. Included: pesticides, oil field smoke and radioactive depleted uranium used in armor-piercing weapons.

Urnovitz said the chromosome damage may result from the body's response to the toxins. But he said the effects of the toxins may accumulate, meaning symptoms of the mysterious disease may not appear until years after exposure.

"If there are 100,000 sick now, the new research means the other 600,000 who served may just be in a queue to start

developing illnesses later on," Urnovitz said.

About one-seventh of American troops in the Gulf War — more than 100,000 men and women — have complained of illnesses with multiple symptoms. Private and government scientists have been trying to figure out their problems.

Urnovitz is science director for two organizations, the non-profit Chronic Illness Research Foundation and the publicly traded research firm Calypso Biomedical, both of Berkeley, Calif.

Scientists already have discovered that human genes, when exposed to destructive agents, will rearrange themselves into a new format, different from a person's original genetic map.

The body then programs the death of damaged cells for the greater good of the body.

Urnovitz believes the nucleic acids that normally do this somehow insert a new genetic blueprint into the nucleus. So, instead of killing itself, the damaged cell sends messages to other cells, which may respond with harmful proteins or other substances. "This reaction takes years," Urnovitz said.

His hypothesis is that the

damaged nucleic acids build up. "And as they accumulate, they increase your risk for chronic illnesses. They accumulate until they hit a threshold, and then the disease kicks in."

Urnovitz also thinks his research may provide insight into some mysterious illnesses of the past.

Thousands of tons of chemical weapons were used on the battlefield during World War I. Afterward, the "Spanish flu" epidemic of 1918 killed approximately 20 million people worldwide. Urnovitz says the genotoxic environment created by the use of poison gas may have helped foster the illness,

which spread worldwide.

Arthur Krieg, a University of Iowa immunologist who also will present a paper at the microbiology society meeting, said Urnovitz's theory "is a potentially important observation that could go beyond Gulf War illnesses and help us understand more about the causes of many other diseases."

James Tuite III, a director of the Chronic Illness Research Foundation and the Senate investigator who brought Gulf War illnesses to widespread public attention four years ago, said the new research is important because of the Pentagon's repeated claims that the symptoms mostly are stress-related.

Newsweek

May 25, 1998

## Faster Troop Carriers

**W**ILL AMERICA'S ARMY OF THE FUTURE SPEED INTO action aboard giant ships skimming the ocean at 100 knots? A sleek black catamaran that arrives for Pentagon inspection this week at Fort Eustis on Virginia's James River may hold part of the answer. Built in Tasmania for car-ferry service, The Cat — which is 300 feet long and powered by water jet — can carry 900 passengers and 240 cars at 43 knots. Serious in its quest for sea speed, DOD gathered 220 experts last fall to discuss its vision: a fleet of ultrafast, sea-lift ships able to carry up to 10,000 tons apiece at up to 100 knots for 10,000 nautical miles. The conclusion: the technology could be ready by 2010. Apart from the catamaran, possible designs include ships riding on air cushions and monohulls so long and thin they need outriggers to stay upright.

European Stars & Stripes

May 18, 1998

Pg. 1

## Troops See Grim Work At Graves Hundreds Found At Bosnia Sites

By Jerry Merideth,  
Bosnia Bureau

CANCARI, Bosnia and Herzegovina —doubts Army Staff Sgt. Hector Nieves might have had about his role as a peacekeeper vaporized the moment he saw the tangled mound of corpses unearthed a U.N. team along a rugged country road.

"If any soldier asks himself, 'Why am I here?' he should take a look at it," said of the mass grave. "They'll get the answer pretty quick."

The work by a U.N. team of archaeologists and forensic investigators in the American sector of Bosnia put Nieves' platoon of 2<sup>nd</sup> Battalion, 22<sup>nd</sup> Infantry soldiers Fort Drum, N.Y., in the area to provide security.

Until recently, the area — eight miles from Zvornik where U.S. troops stand watch — was a hiding place for the bodies of Bosnians executed during the 1992-1995 Yugoslavian civil war, according site spokeswoman Kelly Moore. As many as 10 hidden mass graves are along the road, she said.

For more than two years, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia has been looking for the bodies of 8,000 men assumed massacred during the fall of the Muslim enclave at Srebrenica. Though protected by the United Nations, the enclave fell

to Serbian forces in 1995. About 480 bodies were exhumed from mass graves in 1996.

"We exhumed two major sites in 1996 and then the one at Dulici-Ernica Dam just a couple of weeks ago. Those were primary mass graves located at or near the site of the execution," Moore said. The digging at Cancari marks the first exhumation of a "secondary grave" in the Srebrenica investigation, according to Moore.

"They dug up the bodies and moved them to this small, isolated spot. They were trying to hide something. It isn't hidden anymore. We found it and opened it." Evidence gathered from mass graves will be used to support existing indictments or possible future war crimes indictments issued by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Moore said.

Unnamed tribunal sources quoted by The New York Times said the attempts to conceal victims' bodies might spur charges against those involved.

The bodies in the pit at Cancari had been mangled by the earth movers used to hide the evidence of genocide. The intertwined limbs and torsos made counting the number of human bodies difficult, Moore said.

"We're not dealing with intact corpses. It's a jumble of

bodies tangled together, with clothing wrapped around them. The process of removing them is going quite slow."

An international forensics team began digging a trench around the pit Tuesday to gauge its size. On Wednesday, the team inched inward until reaching the tangle of bodies filling the grave. Work to remove the human remains started Thursday after-noon.

On Friday, workers wearing disposable blue jump suits and rubber surgical gloves dug around the corpses in a grave 30 feet long by 6 feet wide with hand-sized implements resembling garden tools. At one point, a tribunal team member held a skeleton's hand. Another worker tugged and twisted a human femur from a clump of dark and rotting clothing.

"This is still the top layer of the grave," Moore said. "We don't know how deep it is."

The team used surveying equipment to map the site, planting a "detail pole" amid the tangle of bodies at different points in the dig. Sensors on tripods captured a laser signal from the pole, plotting points in the pit.

"What we will be able to do when this is all finished is produce a detailed map of the mass grave," Moore said.

The team will remove the exposed mass of corpses. If more are underneath, they will dig deeper, Moore said.

Not every body from the grave will be identified.

"Identification is made to the extent that it is necessary to

establish links in the case," Moore said. "We do not necessarily try to identify every body. We do try to establish the cause and manner of death, the age, gender and civilian or military status. When we're done here the evidence goes to the ICTY morgue at Visoko."

The tribunal cooperates closely with civilian authorities working to identify the bodies. Items with value for the tribunal investigation are stored for use in prosecuting war criminals, Moore said.

The bodies were moved sometime after the events in Srebrenica in the summer of 1995 and the signing of Dayton peace accord later that year, Moore said. The team of archaeologists and forensic investigators has been working to unearth the remains of massacred Bosnian war victims for three years.

For now, officials lack the evidence to tie the open grave southwest of Zvornik to any of the three execution sites. The answer might lie somewhere in the pit with the decomposing bodies, Moore said. "At the dam, we were looking for things around the grave because it was an execution site. We found shell casings and human bone fragments. Then we found human remains, clothing and personal effects inside the grave."

"We plan on conducting exhumations at various locations for several months. We hope to find as much evidence as we possibly can that will not only further the investigation,

but put the people who committed the crime behind bars for a long, long time." At Cancari, all of the evidence was buried with the victims.

The mass grave is a piece of a larger puzzle, Moore said. "It's a piece that has to fit. Why did they do this? That is our concern." The same question wore heavily on the minds of Nieves and other U.S. troops such as Army Cpl. James Dupuis, who patrolled the area checking for parked trucks or moving cars. The area was quiet except for woodcutters at work in the treeline. The houses along the road had been stripped of windows and doors. The homes were pocked with bullet holes, and many had

collapsed into rubble.

Dupuis' mind moved to the families of the people inside the grave. Those families must wonder daily who is alive, the corporal said.

"I think it's good that they're doing it so that if they find out who the people are, they can let their families know so they can get on with their lives," said Dupuis, a native of Southbridge, Mass.

Downwind of the pit in a gentle breeze, Nieves sniffed and wrinkled his nose. After nine days at the site, he had almost gotten used to the odor, he said.

At times, the soldiers stopped to talk with U.N. team members. Their conversation

brought them to the edge of the mass grave, a grizzly sight.

"The smell is not as bad as seeing them reach into the pit and pull somebody out and the body falls to pieces," Nieves said. Neither Nieves, Dupuis nor their platoon sergeant, Sgt. 1st Class Robert Wright, had pulled guard duty at a mass grave before.

Wright's infantrymen normally pull security duty on the gates at Eagle Base, near Tuzla. They had been detailed for the security mission and had kept the mission under wraps until they moved to the area. The troops wouldn't need any pictures of the site to remember what they'd seen. The soldiers say the dirt that sticks

to their boots at the site carries the odor.

"It really sinks in and makes them understand what happened over here," said Wright.

Most of the platoon waited up a small hill from the site near a portable radio antenna. They relayed details of the operation at Cancari to the Camp Dobol, where troops are based during the excavations. It's hard to shake the smell permeating from the pit or the sight of the bodies in the mass grave, Wright said.

"The story needs to get out about what happened here," he said. "I've been in the Army for 14 years, and I've never seen anything like this."

European Stars & Stripes

May 16, 1998

Pg. 4

## Separatists Will Not Stall Return Of Refugees, NATO Official Vows

By Ron Jensen  
Belgium Bureau

SHAPE, Belgium — Gen. Wesley K. Clark, the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, said the unrest in Kosovo is a serious threat to the peace process in the former Yugoslavia and that NATO is looking at options to keep it from getting out of control.

And a senior NATO military official, who did not want to be identified, vowed that ethnic separatists will not be able to halt the process of peace by standing in the way when refugees within Bosnia and Herzegovina try to return to their pre-war homes.

"I think everybody understands that Kosovo presents a serious threat to regional stability because of the passion of the Albanian majority in Kosovo (and) the strong resistance of supporters — by force of arms — of the Serbian minority," Clark said Friday afternoon during an interview with The Stars and Stripes.

NATO is looking at several plans, he said, mostly aimed at preventing the unrest from spilling across the borders of the former Yugoslavia. One of those plans includes stationing NATO troops along the Albanian border. He said Western governments have called for negotiations to end,

without conditions, the unrest that has claimed dozens of lives in recent months.

"NATO believes this is the most desirable approach to a solution," Clark said. "And the sooner the better." In a separate session Friday with several reporters, the senior military NATO official said separatists who claim the different ethnic groups will not be able to co-exist in Bosnia will be proved wrong and that the return of the refugees will take place.

Calling the return of these people the heart of the peace process, the official said September elections will push the process forward if the right people are put into office when Bosnians vote for cantonal and national assembly members, as well as for the three-person presidency. "These people are very serious. They want to go home," the official said of the refugees. "And this is a real threat. There are clear signs that ethnic separatists are out to sabotage the return process."

Calling the elections an important point in the peace implementation mission, the NATO official said the results will be watched carefully.

"We've got to get the right people in office — people who believe in the Dayton agreement," he said. Since the agreement was signed in December 1995 and the imple-

mentation mission began, freedom of refugees to move back to their pre-war homes has been a major barrier to true peace in the now-divided region. Muslims, Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats all faced dangers if they returned to homes in an entity controlled by another faction. Now, more than two years later, the time has come to lick this problem, the official said.

"This is a profound challenge that is at the heart of the Dayton agreement," the official said.

Many refugees are moving home, and some are making the move without provocation. This helps discredit those separatists who want the country divided even more strictly along ethnic lines.

But demonstrations and violence have marked the arrival of other returnees to their former homes. The NATO official said that no one side in

Bosnia is innocent. Evidence shows that all have made returns dangerous for all three ethnic groups.

But, he said, the people who foment the violence are doing so in an orchestrated way and must be discredited. Successful returns and a positive vote in the fall would do that, he said.

NATO is now developing a multinational force that will have additional police training so it can deal with civil unrest surrounding the returns. The official said this new force will begin its duty in July when the current Stabilization Force mission ends and the next one begins. He described it as a military force that also can handle police duties. It will be sent by road or air to a place where unrest is possible in the wake of refugee returns. The first such force will be made up of several hundred Italian and Argentine troops.

Washington Post May 18, 1998 Pg. 12

## Police, Ethnic Albanians Clash In Kosovo

KIJEVO, Yugoslavia -- Serbian police exchanged fire yesterday with militant ethnic Albanians seeking independence for Kosovo province. The gunfire injured one officer and reportedly killed or wounded an unknown number of Albanians.

The latest violence, coming two days after the start of U.S.-

brokered talks on the province's future, further dampened hopes of a negotiated settlement to the crisis.

The fighting occurred in Iglarevo -- a village 25 miles west of Kosovo's capital, Pristina -- in an area increasingly controlled by the militants, who say they belong to the Kosovo Liberation Army. The clandestine group has claimed responsibility for killing dozens of Serbs and ethnic Albanians loyal to the government.

Legi-Slate

May 15, 1998

## Cohen Finding It Difficult To Take The Hill For Clinton

By George C. Wilson  
LEGI-SLATE News Service

### News Analysis

WASHINGTON (May 15) - The last few days dramatize how difficult it has become for Republican Defense Secretary William S. Cohen to take the Hill -- Capitol Hill, that is -- for his Democratic commander-in-chief, President Clinton.

Two days after becoming the 20th secretary of defense on Jan. 24, 1997, Cohen, a Maine Republican who served in the House and Senate, vowed "to build a bipartisan consensus on national security policies" and bridge the chasm that existed between the White House and Republicans on Capitol Hill.

Fifteen months later, that consensus is hard to find and the reasons go far beyond the usual partisan politics, although politics have slowed Cohen down.

The argument over how much money is enough for national defense now looms as the big consensus breaker, not party politics. Until recently, most of the debate has focused on how to distribute money within the overall budget, whose size was predetermined by last year's balanced budget agreement between Congress and the administration.

"It's time to begin to look at that cap" put on defense spending "and remove that cap," Sen. Bob Smith, R-N.H., said this week as the Senate opened debate on the bill [S. 2057] to authorize \$271 billion for national defense in the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1.

Smith, chairman of the Armed Services Strategic Forces Subcommittee, lamented that there was not enough money in the bill to distribute to all the worthy weapons programs.

"We need to increase spending for our Defense Department," agreed Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb. "We have a military that we continue to hollow out. We will pay a severe price for what we're doing."

Smith, Hagel and the other complaining senators have found that they cannot fairly blame the president or his defense secretary for the money gaps in the defense budget because, in the interest of balancing the federal budget, both Republicans and Democrats voted to impose fiscal ceilings on the Pentagon.

Still, the philosophical divide between weapons hawks and deficit hawks stands between Cohen and his consensus goal. And other recent developments spotlight even more obstacles standing in his way:

-- **Readiness.** "There is clear evidence that the combat readiness of the armed forces is at greater risk due to two key factors: older and harder to maintain equipment resulting from inadequate modernization and the overuse of a smaller force structure," said the Senate Armed Services Committee in the report accompanying the Pentagon authorization bill now being debated.

And the House National Security Committee concluded in its report on the House authorization bill [H.R. 3616]: "After 14 consecutive years of real decline in defense spending, it has become exceedingly difficult to maintain our nation's All Volunteer Force." The committee's chairman, Rep. Floyd Spence, R-S.C., has charged repeatedly that the Clinton administration has allowed the readiness of the armed forces to decline.

These congressional criticisms on readiness come against the backdrop of repeated promises by Cohen to keep the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps ready to fight. The day before the House committee lodged its complaint about readiness, a senior Pentagon official told reporters at a formal briefing on the issue that Cohen's "highest priority is military readiness."

Although there has been no revolt by the Joint Chiefs of Staff over their orders to cover world hotspots with a downsized force, many field officers

complain that they are stretched too thin.

Clinton's strategy calls for fielding enough forces to fight two regional wars almost simultaneously. Critics point out this is asking the military to do too much with too little, citing the comparison between the forces the United States fielded in 1968, which were supposed to be ready to fight one big war against the Warsaw Pact while waging a supposedly small one in Vietnam.

In 1968, at the height of the Vietnam War, the active duty personnel strengths of the services were: Army, 1.57 million; Navy, 765,000; Air Force, 905,000; Marine Corps, 307,000. Clinton's defense plans calls for these active duty strengths at the end of this fiscal year: Army, 480,000; Navy, 373,000; Air Force, 371,000; Marine Corps, 172,000.

The two-war strategy is unrealistic given the size of today's forces, one general conceded in an interview, "but we can't say that without making South Korea think we're not going to cover them."

Gen. Ronald R. Fogleman, who retired as Air Force Chief of Staff last year, told an audience in Camden, Maine, last week that the response times for heavy Army forces in current war plans are unrealistic and require a degree of readiness that wastes money. The administration's current plan of providing \$250 billion a year plus inflation to the armed forces "may be too much" for what the armed services actually could and would do in a war, in contrast with the out-of-touch requirements in the war plans, Fogleman added.

-- **Base closings.** "Unless we get the savings" from base closings, Cohen said last month, "I will not be able to achieve the modernization goals or to find the resources necessary to avoid an erosion of readiness." He estimated that base closings in 2001 and 2005 would save up to \$20 billion between 2008 and 2015 that could be spent on hardware and people.

Cohen has spent the most time with the least results to reach consensus on base closings. For one thing, his high-profile efforts were handicapped by President Clinton from the beginning. Clinton

decided to keep two bases open in California and Texas before the 1996 election after lawmakers from those states had taken the political heat by agreeing to close them.

The White House then compounded Cohen's problems with Congress when it was revealed a few days ago that John Podesta, Clinton's deputy chief of staff, had told the Air Force that the administration had an "interest" in keeping California's McClellan Air Force Base in business. The White House's interest came to light when an internal memo was read aloud at a House subcommittee voting session on the fiscal 1999 defense bill.

As a result, any future administration base closing plan is "dead on arrival," Rep. Tillie Fowler, R-Fla., said in expressing the now prevailing sentiment in Congress.

-- **Missile defense.** "We had better get busy and develop and deploy a system" for stopping a missile attack on the United States, Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., told his Senate colleagues on Wednesday in urging them to support his bill [S. 1873] to require the president to deploy an anti-missile system as soon as technologically feasible, regardless of whether there was a visible threat or not. "If we can't detect that India is about to test a nuclear warhead," Cochran said, referring to India's underground tests that caught U.S. intelligence agencies by surprise, "then we need to change our policy."

Unlike most of the other obstacles Cohen confronts, Republicans and Democrats are sharply divided on the question of whether to deploy a \$40 billion missile defense or continue to rely on deterrence, the ability to destroy any would-be missile attacker with retaliatory fire. Cochran won over only four Democrats when the Senate, on a 59 to 41 roll call vote Wednesday, failed to invoke cloture to cut off debate on his missile defense bill.

Democrats voting with the 55 Republicans to limit filibusters against the missile defense plan were Sens. Daniel K. Akaka of Hawaii, Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina, Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii, and Joseph I. Lieberman of

Connecticut. Cloture required 60 votes.

Despite the administration's one-vote victory on the missile bill, many Republicans in this year's elections plan to hammer Clinton for what they say is a policy that would leave the United States naked against missile attack. Such charges threaten to set back Cohen's progress in building a consensus for holding off deployment of a missile fence around the United States until a clear threat emerges.

So far, Clinton, unlike most of his recent predecessors, has declined to get out front to champion or oppose a missile defense or any other multibillion-dollar weapons program.

President Kennedy risked a big fight with the defense giants in Congress, notably former Chairman Carl Vinson, D-Ga., of the House Armed Services Committee, and canceled the Air Force B-70 bomber. President Johnson vigorously defended that decision and championed a thin missile defense. President Carter killed the B-1 bomber and scuttled Navy plans to build a new aircraft carrier. President Bush canceled the Navy A-12 bomber upon recommendation of Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney.

"To kill a major defense program," said the late Les Aspin, the Wisconsin Democrat who chaired the House Armed Services Committee and served as defense secretary in Clinton's turbulent first year in office, "the president has to get out front on it."

On the positive side, Cohen has managed to persuade Congress to commit the money needed to extend the U.S. military mission in Bosnia, which Clinton wants to continue indefinitely. As a senator, Cohen opposed an indefinite stay, but as defense secretary, he led the lobbying effort to secure emergency funds to pay current Bosnia expenses and \$1.9 billion for the next fiscal year's mission costs.

Another achievement in Cohen's consensus building drive was helping to convince the Senate to add the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the NATO alliance. And with his deputy, John Hamre -- once a senior Senate Armed

Services Committee aide -- Cohen has softened criticism of the Pentagon's often outrageously unwieldy procurement and financial management systems by undertaking an ambitious reform program.

Nonetheless, the Pentagon's inability to account for all the money it spends still distresses many lawmakers, with Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, at the forefront of the protest.

In personnel policy, Cohen lost ground when the House National Security Committee rejected his policy of allowing male and female recruits in the Army, Navy and Air Force to train alongside each other. The committee voted to adopt the recommendations of the Kassebaum commission to separate males and females during their initial military training, which the Marine Corps already does.

The committee's position is not yet law, however, since the House and Senate authorization bills are still wending their way through Congress.

But peering into the 21st century, Cohen's former colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee did not like what they saw. "The Department of Defense modernization program, as currently outlined, cannot be sustained," the committee said in its just-released report on the fiscal 1999 authorization bill.

"Continued annual delays of procurement create a very large and insurmountable unfunded procurement requirement," the committee added, warning of a funding gap in the next century. "The Department of Defense has not even tried to quantify the nature and scope of the bow wave problem," the

panel said.

The independent Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments predicts the Pentagon will be short, by \$26 billion a year, of the money needed to pay for its defense plan for fiscal 2004 through 2009.

Although Cohen probably will not be still trying to take the Hill in the 21st century, Pentagon officials say there are already gaps between weapons on order and the money needed to pay for them. In that case, revelations about cost overruns and money gaps will further complicate Cohen's efforts to build a consensus for a national defense program in the time he has left to serve as CEO of the largest corporation on earth -- one that spends \$500,000 a minute.

New York Times

May 18, 1998

Essay / By William Safire

## U.S. Security For Sale

WASHINGTON -- A President hungry for money to finance his re-election overruled the Pentagon; he sold to a Chinese Military Intelligence front the technology that defense experts argued would give Beijing the capacity to blind our spy satellites and launch a sneak attack. How soon we have forgotten Pearl Harbor.

October 1996 must have been some tense month for Democratic fund-raisers. The New York Times, Wall Street Journal and Los Angeles Times had begun to expose "the Asian connection" of John Huang and Indonesia's Riady family to the Clinton campaign.

The fix was already in to sell the satellite technology to China. Clinton had switched the licensing over to Ron Brown's anything-goes Commerce Department. Johnny Chung had paid up. Commerce's Huang had delivered money big time (though one of his illegal foreign sources had already been spotted). The boss of the satellite's builder had come through as Clinton's largest contributor.

But public outrage was absent. The F.B.I. didn't read the papers and Reno Justice did not want to embarrass the President. And television news

found no pictorial values in the Asian connection.

Stealthily, the Clinton Administration held back the implementation of the corrupt policy until Nov. 5 -- the day the campaign ended.

Now the reporting of Jeff Gerth and The Times's investigative team is putting the spotlight of pitiless publicity on the sellout of American security.

We begin to see how the daughter of China's top military commander steered at least \$300,000 through the Chung channel to the D.N.C. (Apparently Mr. Chung skimmed off a chunk and may be spilling his guts lest he have to face his Beijing friends.)

We begin to learn more of the Feb. 8, 1996, visit of the arms dealer Wang Jun to the Commerce office of Ron Brown, and Wang's "coffee" meeting that day with the President, the very day that Clinton approved four Chinese launches -- even as China was terrorizing Taiwan with missile tests.

Clinton's explanation, which used to slyly suggest that China policy was not changed "solely" by contributors, has now switched to total ignorance: shucks, we didn't know the source of the money. But

this President's D.N.C. did not know because it wanted not to know; procedures long in place to prevent the unlawful inflow of foreign funds were uprooted by the money-hungry Clintons.

Today, two years after this sale of our security, comes the unforeseen chain reaction: as China strengthens its satellite and missile technology, a new Indian Government reacts to the growing threat from its longtime Asian rival and joins the nuclear club. In turn, China feels pressed to supply its threatened ally, Pakistan, with weaponry Beijing promised us not to transfer.

This makes Clinton the Proliferation President.

Who has helped keep this sellout of security under wraps? In the Senate, John Glenn was rewarded with a space flight by Clinton for derogating the leads to China of the Thompson committee. Fred Thompson's warnings about China's plan to penetrate this White House were then scorned by Democratic partisans; his Government Operations Committee should now swarm all over this.

The House's aggressive agent of the Clinton cover-up, Henry Waxman of California, is finally "troubled" by the prospect of damning evidence he prevented the Burton committee from finding. At

least three Democratic partisans who foolishly followed Waxman in blocking the testimony of Asian witnesses may have difficulty explaining their cover-up vote to even more troubled voters in their districts.

The Gerth revelations lead

to more questions: Where were the chiefs of the C.I.A. and the National Security Agency, their intelligence so dependent on satellites, on the satellite technology sale to China?

Is anybody at Reno Justice re-examining testimony taken by independent counsel inves-

tigating corruption at Commerce before Ron Brown's death? Does Brown's former lawyer claim "dead man's privilege" on notes? Did N.S.A. tape overseas calls of suspect Commerce officials? Who induced Commerce to lobby Clinton for control of satellite

technology?

And the most immediate: Will homesick prosecutor Charles LaBella, beholden to Janet Reno for his political appointment in San Diego, dare to offend his patron by calling for independent counsel?

Rowland Evans and Robert D. Novak

Washington Post

May 18, 1998

Pg. 17

# What Punishment for India's Audacity?

An "urgent" letter on April 3 from Pakistani Prime Minister Muhammad Nawaz Sharif to President Clinton warned that India was on the verge of a nuclear-testing program that could wreck Clinton's nonproliferation strategy, the foundation of his post-Cold War policy, and trigger a new nuclear arms race.

The prime minister's letter predicted that India was about to take "a giant step" toward testing and producing nuclear weapons, but it rang no alarm bells at the White House. The letter simply was sent to the CIA, now the target of criticism for failing to detect the tests in advance. Nevertheless, the administration called no emergency meetings. The unprecedented warning was not a subject for special attention in regular, routine briefing sessions between the CIA and National Security Adviser Sandy Berger.

Instead, Clinton's aides relied on a more benign analysis of India's intentions. They believed the newly elected right-wing government's announcement of a "strategic security review" of India's position in the world would take months. That voided any possibility of immediate nuclear testing—despite the well-known commitment of the new prime minister, A. B. Vajpayee, and his nationalistic party to make India the world's sixth nuclear power. The letter from Pakistan was chalked up at the White House to a bad case of the jitters.

But Prime Minister Sharif had it right. He warned that the "strategic review" itself was the signal of India's imminent switch from conventional to nuclear weapons. He wrote that it should be seen as "a giant step toward fully operationalizing Indian nuclear policy." The certainty of this shift, he told Clinton, had already "qualitatively altered the security environment" in South Asia and dealt a "serious blow to efforts at promoting nonproliferation at the global and regional levels."

Nuclear nonproliferation, the core of Clinton's post-Cold War foreign policy, now lies in the wreckage of last week's underground testing pits

in Rajasthan. "We're in a box," Sen. Joseph Biden, top Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told a subcommittee last week, "and we need a new idea." Sen. Sam Brownback, the subcommittee's Republican chairman, proclaimed that India's nuclear coup had opened "a new phase of world history."

Clinton is making Herculean efforts to entice Pakistan not to go nuclear and help save nonproliferation as the world's first line of defense. At the least, this would require Congress to repeal long-standing sanctions imposed on Islamabad for its own nuclear program. That would release 28 F-16 war planes paid for by Pakistan with \$600 million in cash but never delivered, plus billions in long-term aid. But buying off Pakistan would at best be only a temporary stopgap.

In fact, India's easy, forced entry into the exclusive club of five nuclear nations is an open invitation to other states that also refuse to accept dictation by the Big Five (the United States, Britain, Russia, China and France) on who can join the nuclear club. Four of these countries with nuclear ambitions—North Korea, Iran, Libya and Iraq—are designated "terrorist states" by the State Department. Israel, a special case because it has the protection of the United States, for years has been an unannounced, underground but widely acknowledged member of the exclusive group.

Compounding Clinton's problem in reconstructing nonproliferation or, as Biden wants, coming up with a "new idea," is the persistent confusion and lack of agreement among the Big Five. Neither layer upon layer of

American sanctions for breaching U.S. rules on nonproliferation nor Clinton's persistent efforts to hold the line has formed the basis of a common policy.

Russia long has been an open market for Iran to buy nuclear materials that could help it make the bomb. China has been feeding both nuclear high-technology and medium-range ballistic missiles to Pakistan. Neither has been sanctioned by the United States.

Perhaps even worse is lack of consensus on how to punish India. France and Russia both have said they will not impose the kind of sanctions invoked by Clinton, and the European Union is ambivalent. Does this send a message that joining the nuclear club by stealth, as India did, may be relatively cost-free?

©1998, Creators Syndicate Inc.

Los Angeles Times

May 17, 1998

PERSPECTIVE ON SOUTH ASIA

## Punishment: Make It Swift, Severe

*A preemptive military strike is the only way to neutralize India's nuclear capability. Sanctions won't work.*

By Benazir Bhutto

While the world slept, India detonated a series of nuclear tests signaling its determination to threaten the entire nonproliferation regime in the region.

That India chose to detonate nuclear devices on the eve of President Clinton's visit this coming November to South Asia showed its defiance of world opinion in the age of Pax Americana.

The post-Cold War global regime has been predicated on the free flow of information and technology. This, we believed, was a world of markets, not missiles. However, India chose to gamble more than \$30 billion of foreign investments on a series of tests that have

united the nation behind its weak coalition government.

The Indian explosion is a direct challenge to the American-led efforts to arrive at a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and at a regime to control weapons of mass destruction.

To Pakistan, which suffered disintegration at the hands of India in 1971, it is a clear warning to desist from its support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir at the insistence of a nuclear India. China, surely, is uneasy too.

As prime minister of Pakistan, I tried to persuade Western leaders for more than a decade that, in the absence of Western mediation, South Asia was plunging head long into a

proliferation race that Pakistan did not want and sought to prevent.

I stressed that the 50-year-old Indo-Pak dispute over Kashmir, where an uprising had tied down 600,000 Indian troops, was leading to a dangerous flash point in the South Asia region. Alas, my pleadings failed to convince a Western world preoccupied with the Middle East peace talks and the bloodshed in Bosnia, Rwanda and other parts of the world.

Western leaders believed that they preferred India and Pakistan to bilaterally deal with the dispute that threatened a nuclear race. This was a strategic error. It paved the way for India to come out openly as a nuclear power.

What is the Pakistani reac-

tion? Pakistanis believe that the West will impose sanctions for some time but ultimately acquiesce to India as a nuclear power. After a decade, the West will reward India, as a nuclear power, with a seat on the U.N. Security Council along with other members of the nuclear club.

Two years ago, when the Chinese and the French tested nuclear devices, as prime minister of Pakistan I received disturbing reports that a frustrated Indian military wanted to force Pakistan's nuclear hand before making a decision on a military solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. A segment of the Indian military

doubted whether Pakistan had nuclear capability or was bluffing to create a nuclear deterrence that did not exist. An Indian explosion, they believed, would force Pakistan to come into the open. If Pakistan did not have a nuclear capability, India could consider a military solution of the Kashmir dispute.

Pakistan had not actually put together a device--although it could do so--as a signal to the West of its support to a non-proliferation regime unless its security was threatened. An Indian detonation, our experts believed, would threaten Pakistan's security unless we could create an equilibrium through

deterrence.

Pakistan decided to open the option of a test by making the necessary preparations to respond with a nuclear test of its own within 30 days unless the West showed the will to stop India in its nuclear tracks. Pakistan also decided that if it was forced to detonate, it would follow up with a unilateral signing of the international agreements aimed at controlling weapons of mass destruction.

This is surely a nightmare situation for the West. What can the West do? Doling out military and economic assistance can shore up Pakistan's security for a decade. But as Pakistan learned in the after-

math of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, not more than that. Nor can a West that failed to prevent the Indian test guarantee that a weak Indian coalition government rashly seeking popular support would not equally rashly seek a nuclear war in South Asia.

I am not a military expert. But I believe that sanctions are not simply enough. Rogue nations that defy world opinion ought to be taught a lesson. If a preemptive military strike is possible to neutralize India's nuclear capability, that is the response that is necessary.

*Benazir Bhutto, former prime minister of Pakistan, is now the opposition leader.*

Chicago Tribune

May 17, 1998

## How To Deal With A Nuclear India

President Clinton and congressional leaders have vigorously condemned the five nuclear test explosions carried out by the Indian government, and U.S. sanctions have been invoked. Those were necessary steps. But as Defense Secretary William Cohen says, the genie is out of the bottle in South Asia. India is obviously determined to upgrade its atomic arsenal and become a full-fledged nuclear power. Its longtime adversary, Pakistan, is under great domestic pressure to follow suit.

Given that unsettling reality, the U.S. cannot be content with condemnation and punishment. It also has to look for ways to minimize the grave risks posed by two bitter enemies facing each other with doomsday weapons that can strike within minutes.

Like offering clean needles to drug addicts, this approach runs the risk of diluting the primary message--in this case, that nuclear proliferation is a terrible thing. But the price has to be paid to avert the ghastly prospect of nuclear war in the South Asian subcontinent.

What can be done? Even as the world denounces India, efforts should be made to bring India into the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which forbids all tests. Some experts think New Delhi will be willing to do that, now that it has conducted the tests it regards

as essential.

An even more urgent task is assisting India and Pakistan in lengthening the fuse that could ignite a conflagration. The needs fall into three categories. The first are technical measures to prevent missiles or bombers from being dispatched accidentally or without central authorization. The second involve establishing communications links and military procedures to make sure that neither side misunderstands the actions of the other. And the third are steps to protect nuclear stockpiles from attack--which will eliminate the incentive to launch them in a crisis for fear of losing them.

The United States and the Soviet Union, over the course of the Cold War, pioneered techniques for stabilizing the balance of terror. They also demonstrated that the possession of nuclear weapons does not have to lead to their use. But the history of conflict between India and Pakistan, the ongoing disputes over Kashmir and Punjab and the proximity of the two nations make the task of managing nuclear arsenals even harder than it was for Washington and Moscow.

To do it, these countries will need help from the United States and its allies, something the Clinton administration will doubtless find hard to reconcile with its opposition to the tests. But the stakes are too high to refuse.

Boston Globe

May 17, 1998

Pg. E6

## West Point's dishonor code

Ducking responsibility is routine in much of America, but West Point is supposed to stand for character. The school's decision to let an annulment erase a violation of its no-marriage regulation sank that reputation into loophole gulch.

West Point, like all US military academies, forbids cadets to marry and expels them if they do. But two quick-thinking fourth-year cadets with a baby got around the rule by getting their marriage annulled and then going ahead with graduation plans as though nothing had happened.

Using "Catch-22" logic, a press officer for the school explained away the infraction this way Friday: "According to the legal definition of what took place, nothing took place."

The honor code was not violated either, the press officer noted, because that code prohibits lying, cheating, and stealing but does not mention marriage, which comes under a separate rule. Since the cadets admitted they were married when asked, there was no lie.

But what of the lie of pretense? What of the stealing that snatched legal status from a child? What of the cheating that let an institution walk the most narrow of ethical lines while ignoring the larger moral questions?

West Point regulations allow a cadet to get pregnant and return after medical leave as long as she does not get married. The school accepts male and female cadets with children as long as the cadets have relinquished custody of these children and have no financial responsibility for them.

While parents at West Point are a rarity, as are pregnancies and secret marriages, the regulations governing these issues would seem to condone - and even encourage - behavior unbecoming an officer.

The recent annulment decision allowed everyone involved an easy way out of trouble. It set a precedent for others to do the same at an institution with the mission of training future military leaders to make tough choices under fire.

West Point should revamp its policies to keep pace with a co-ed Army. If officers can serve while married, so can cadets, who should be encouraged to live up to all their commitments.

# Making military sense out of Kyoto

By Frank Carlucci

Prior to the 1997 Kyoto meeting on global climate change, Defense Secretary William Cohen issued this stern warning: "America's national security requires that its military forces remain ready. While global climate change may be a serious threat to the nation's long-term interests, there are other threats we must not forget. We must not sacrifice our national security to achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions."

Regrettably, the administration has failed to heed that warning from its own top defense official and agreed to a climate treaty that fails to spell out the impact on the U.S. military.

While Congress initially raised questions about the economic impact of the accord, there is growing concern in the Senate, which must ratify the treaty, about agreeing to a treaty that imposes unprecedented restraint on military action and training.

By agreeing to restrict greenhouse gas emissions, and leaving the accord's impact on military operations ambiguous, the administration has effectively hamstrung the Defense Department's ability to protect national security interests and invited mischief by foes who can now use the accord to press for U.S. military cutbacks.

Here's how: Under the Kyoto accord, the administration has committed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to essentially 1979 levels. The U.S. government is the nation's largest energy user, and the Pentagon is the largest energy user within the government. By signing the treaty, the administration has agreed to scale back fuel use by the U.S. military — a dangerous commitment that could have a disastrous impact on force readiness.

The Pentagon itself warned that a 10 percent reduction in Army fuel use would "downgrade readiness and require up to six additional weeks to prepare and deploy. Strategic deployment schedules would be missed, placing operations at risk."

A similar reduction by the Air Force "would result in the loss of over 210,000 flying hours per year" and a Navy cutback "would cut some 2,000 steaming days per year for deployed ships, causing cancellation of both bilateral and multi-lateral exercises."

The Committee to Preserve American Security and Sovereignty

— a concerned group of former U.S. foreign policy advisers — strongly urges the administration to clarify the impact of the treaty on U.S. force readiness and preparation. Thus far, there has been a troubling lack of clarity and candor on the administration's part over what it committed the Pentagon to in Kyoto.

For example, the Kyoto accord fails to explain what U.S. military operations would count toward U.S. greenhouse gas limits. Operations conducted or sanctioned by the U.N. are not included within a country's greenhouse gas limits.

However, the administration has seemingly failed to take into consideration the possibility that the U.S. might be forced to act alone to protect our national security.

In recent congressional testimony, Deputy Undersecretary for Environmental Security Sherri Goodman said that unilateral operations are "quite rare." True, but certainly the U.S. must have the capability to engage in unilateral operations without environmental issues posing an obstacle to deployment.

Miss Goodman stated military operations such as Panama and Grenada would be exempt. What she fails to remember is that the Panama operation was denounced by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a "unilateral" operation — opening up the possibility it would not be exempt from fuel-limitation restrictions included in the Kyoto accord.

There is also significant concern about the impact the treaty will have on domestic military operations, training, facilities and nontactical vehicles. The administration believes it won a key victory by avoiding language in the protocol on these issues.

But without clarifying language specifically exempting domestic operations from U.S. greenhouse limits, the administration has opened the door to international criticism that the United States is not living up to its Kyoto commitments. Had Kyoto been in effect in 1990, critics would have certainly demanded that the Panama operation count toward our greenhouse

gas limit — a controversy an administration doesn't need in the middle of a military conflict.

Deputy Secretary Goodman raised expectations that fuel used in domestic military operations would be included within U.S. greenhouse limits when she testified in March that the Pentagon does not "seek special treatment." She said the Defense Department "can and should reduce its

greenhouse gas emissions in the same way the rest of the nation will be called to do."

Of particular concern is that the treaty will open the door for hostile nations to seek to hamper U.S. military operations. It is conceivable that every movement made by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and Coast Guard will become subject to controversy over whether the operations are in violation of the Kyoto accord. That would be a diplomatic and military nightmare.

Before Kyoto's dangerous principles go into effect, it is crucial for the administration to dispel concerns about military readiness issues by clarifying its impact on the Pentagon. Such a clarification must detail how the treaty will affect military training, readiness and operations.

Regardless of how the administration interprets the treaty, the Senate must demand a blanket exemption for all military operations. Our national security deserves no less.

In 1992, then-Sen. Al Gore called global climate change the "most serious threat we have ever faced." COMPASS respectfully, but vigorously, disagrees. While environmental issues must be addressed, the U.S. cannot afford to drop its military shield today because of an unproven environmental threat that may loom in the 22nd Century.

*Frank Carlucci is a former Secretary of Defense and current chairman of the Carlyle Group.*

Wall Street Journal May 18, 1998

Pg. 1

The U.S. backed away from a threat to suspend its mediation of Israeli-Palestinian talks. Albright is meeting Arafat in London today, with a senior U.S. mediator flying to

report to her on his meeting with Netanyahu last night in Washington. On the West Bank, six Palestinians were wounded in a fourth day of clashes with Israeli troops.

# Clinton Denies Any Influence Of Chinese Money

By James Bennet

LONDON -- President Clinton said Sunday that reported political campaign contributions from China to the Democrats had not influenced his foreign policy, but he welcomed further investigation into decisions that made it easier for China to launch American satellites and possibly obtain sensitive technology.

"The decisions we made, we made because we thought they were in the interests of the American people," Clinton said, responding for the first time to reports that a Democratic Party fund-raiser told federal investigators of funneling thousands of dollars from a Chinese military officer during the president's 1996 re-election campaign.

Clinton, speaking at the end of an economic summit in Birmingham, England, said he would determine the substance of the charges before deciding whether they would affect policy toward the Chinese government.

"In any case, I think the investigation ought to proceed," he said, "and then whatever the facts are, we'll take appropriate action at that time." Clinton is planning to visit China next month.

The Justice Department's campaign finance task force is investigating whether political contributions influenced the administration's 1996 decision to reverse a State Department policy that had categorized satellites as "munitions," making it more difficult to export them for launch aboard Chinese rockets.

In addition, several congressional committees are looking into whether the administration's policy shift on exporting satellite technology helped China and other countries develop and use nuclear missiles.

The New York Times reported Friday that Johnny Chung, the former fund-raiser, told federal investigators that a large part of the nearly \$100,000 he gave the Democrats during the 1996 campaign came from China's People's

Liberation Army through Liu Chaoying, a Chinese lieutenant colonel and aerospace executive. The Democratic National Committee subsequently returned the money to Chung, who began cooperating with investigators after he pleaded guilty in March to campaign-related bank and tax fraud.

Congressional Republican leaders have accused the administration of being influenced by American aerospace manufacturers, citing Bernard Schwartz, chairman of Loral Space and Communications, who gave more than \$600,000 to the Democratic Party, making him the single largest personal donor.

The administration's decision to waive sanctions and ease the export control process allowed Loral and another aerospace company, Hughes Electronic Corp., a subsidiary of General Motors Corp., to export satellites to be launched atop Chinese rockets.

In his remarks Sunday, Clinton did not directly mention the policy on satellites. But he suggested that the decision to move the authority for exporting the devices from the State Department to the Commerce Department was unanimous within his administration. He said that all of his foreign policy decisions "were based on what we believed -- I and the rest of my administration -- were in the interests of the American people."

The administration's decision to reverse State Department policy and allow the Commerce Department to license the export of sensitive satellite technology even drew concerned comments Sunday from a leading Democrat.

Sen. Joseph Biden Jr., D-Del., who serves as the ranking minority member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said of the administration's policy switch, "This is serious stuff." Interviewed on "Fox News Sunday," Biden said that any "correlation of quid pro quo" linking campaign contributions to a shift in national security policy should be ferreted out.

Rep. Porter Goss, R-Fla., chairman of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, said that an independent counsel may have to be appointed to investigate the Chinese contributions if the Clinton Justice Department fails to conduct a thorough inquiry.

"The sinister element comes in when we start reading that Chinese intelligence is inserting large amounts of money," Goss said on the same program. "Now, I admit it is possible for anybody to be duped in a campaign about where money comes from. But it is very clear that the Chinese had some reason to give large amounts of money. They wanted something for it. What was it the Chinese wanted?"

He also urged Clinton to reconsider his visit to China, as well as put on hold any plans to

visit India.

Samuel Berger, the national security adviser, said in a television interview that the United States began permitting the launching of American satellites aboard Chinese rockets during the Bush administration.

"The reason for that is that the telecommunications industry has a tremendous need to put satellites up into the air and that exceeds the launch capacity of the United States," Berger said, in an interview on CNN's "Late Edition." He also denied that any campaign contributions had influenced foreign policy.

Berger said that, in relying on Chinese rockets, American companies did not risk passing restricted technology on to the Chinese. The satellites, he said, "are put into a black box" under the supervision of the Department of Defense "and taken to China, put on top of the missile and blown up into the sky." He said that there was "not technology transfer."

New York Times May 17, 1998 Pg. 1

## How China Won Rights To Launch Satellites For U.S.

By Jeff Gerth and David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON -- On Oct. 9, 1995, Secretary of State Warren Christopher ended a lengthy internal debate within the Clinton administration by initialing a classified order, preserving the State Department's sharp limits on China's ability to launch American-made satellites aboard Chinese rockets.

Both American industry and state-owned Chinese companies had been lobbying for years to get the satellites off what is known in Washington as the "munitions list," the inventory of America's most sensitive military and intelligence-gathering technology. But Christopher sided with the Defense Department, the intelligence agencies and some of his own advisers, who noted that embedded in commercial satellites were technological secrets that could jeopardize "significant military and intelligence interests."

There was one more reason not to ease the controls, they wrote in a classified memorandum. Doing so would "raise suspicions that we are trying to evade China sanctions" imposed when the country was caught shipping weapons technology abroad -- which is exactly what happened in 1991 and 1993 for missile sales to Pakistan.

The secretary of state's decision to keep satellites on the munitions list, making it harder for them to be exported, did not stand for long. Five months later, President Clinton took the unusual step of reversing Christopher's decision.

Control of export licensing for communications satellites was shifted to the Commerce Department, then run by Ronald Brown.

Both American satellite makers and the Chinese were delighted because the Commerce Department has dual responsibilities: licensing sensitive exports and promoting sales of American goods around the world. Several have already been approved.

One of the beneficiaries of that decision, it now turns out, was China Aerospace because its rockets could launch Ameri-

can satellites. An executive of the state-owned Chinese company, Liu Chao-ying, allegedly provided tens of thousands of dollars from Chinese military intelligence to the Democratic Party in the summer of 1996.

Ms. Liu's involvement was described to federal investigators recently by Johnny Chung, a Democratic fund-raiser who says he took \$300,000 from Ms. Liu -- who is also a lieutenant colonel in the Chinese military -- and donated almost \$100,000 of it to Democratic causes apparently keeping the rest for his businesses.

Clinton's decision was announced in March 1996, several months before the donations. But the actual change was delayed until the fall.

The White House said it did not know the source of Chung's donations and denies that the decision was influenced by campaign donations, domestic or foreign.

"This was motivated by competitiveness and streamlining bureaucracy concerns, and nothing else," Samuel Berger, Clinton's national security adviser, said in an interview two weeks ago.

On Friday, Berger's spokesman, Eric Rubin, said the decision was also part of the administration's China policy, and specifically its effort to encourage China to clamp down on military exports.

"On many occasions, this was discussed with the Chinese government because we believe that policy on satellite licenses is one of the tools we have to strengthen our nonproliferation policy," Rubin said.

Clinton's decision took place after months of tension with Beijing. And only two months after Clinton reversed the secretary of state, the administration said China had agreed to curb its missile and nuclear exports.

In January reports of China's export of nuclear technology to Pakistan and missiles to Iran caused considerable concern in Congress and the Pentagon. In early May, two months after Clinton reversed the secretary of state, the administration said China had agreed to curb its missile and nuclear exports. But that announcement was greeted with considerable skepticism by

Republican critics, including Bob Dole who was well on the way to getting the nomination for president.

During the campaign, the Republicans attacked Clinton for failing to curb China's sales of nuclear and missile technology to other countries. The satellite decision in March was one element of the administration's "carrot-and-stick-approach to working with China," said James Lilley, former American ambassador to Beijing.

But in the way business and diplomacy mix in Washington's dealings with China, the decision also resonated in boardrooms on both sides of the Pacific. It satisfied the commercial interests of the American aerospace industry, which had long sought access to China's low-cost ability to launch satellites into space, aboard rockets called the Long March.

And it bolstered China's own commercial interests. Ms. Liu's parent company, China Aerospace, owns a large piece of a Hong Kong satellite operator. It also owns China Great Wall Industry Corp., the rocket company that launches both private satellites and tests and provides equipment for the missiles in China's nuclear arsenal. It was Great Wall that the State Department sanctioned in 1991 and 1993 for selling missiles to Pakistan.

Other powerful Chinese state enterprises also had multibillion-dollar stakes in getting access to American satellites. Among them was China International Trade and Investment Corp., whose chairman, Wang Jun, gained unwanted fame in the United States last year when it was revealed that he attended one of Clinton's campaign coffee meetings in the White House. The day of Wang's visit, Clinton, in what Rubin said was a coincidence, signed waivers allowing the Chinese to launch four American satellites -- though they were unrelated to the business interests of China International Trade.

"Any suggestions that these decisions were influenced by Wang Jun's presence in the U.S. is completely unfounded," Rubin said.

But there is no doubt that American companies -- part-

ners and suppliers of China International Trade and China Aerospace -- put enormous pressure on the White House. They were also important campaign contributors. For example, the chief executive of Loral gave \$275,000 between November 1995 and June 1996 to the Democrats.

How Clinton came to change the export control rules for satellites to China is a tale of Washington turf wars between the State and Commerce Departments, of arguments over how to balance America's security concerns and commercial competition in the hottest of all the emerging markets.

But it is also a story of how the interests of both large American donors and surreptitious foreign donors to the 1996 campaign intersected.

#### The Precursor:

##### A Strong Push Under Bush

China's drive to obtain a steady stream of satellite technology from the United States preceded the Clinton administration's arrival in Washington.

In 1990, just a year after the killings at Tiananmen Square, officials from China Aerospace and the Chinese government approached Lilley, the American ambassador, pressing for President Bush to waive restrictions enacted in the aftermath of Tiananmen that barred China from launching American satellites.

"They hit me very hard," Lilley recalled recently. "It was a prestige national program. It was putting China on the map as the big space country of the 21st century."

Bush, America's first permanent representative in China, granted a waiver that allowed a launch on one of China's Long March rockets. In 1992, a number of senators -- including Al Gore, then still a senator from Tennessee -- wrote to the Bush administration warning that China was using the launches to "gain foreign aerospace technology that would be otherwise unavailable to it."

During the last days of the 1992 presidential campaign, Gore made the waivers an issue, contending that Bush "has permitted five additional American-built satellites to be launched by the Chinese."

"President Bush really is an incurable patsy for those dictators he sets out to coddle," Gore said during a speech at the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Md.

#### The Argument: Business Leaders Pressure Clinton

Almost as soon as Clinton took office, business leaders began their campaign to drastically change his views about China.

Both Chinese and American companies were working to get satellites off the State Department's munitions list. The rules for exporting goods that are on the list are particularly tough. Congress must be notified 30 days in advance. Moreover, the State Department considers only nonproliferation issues and defers to the Pentagon's judgments. In contrast, the Commerce Department's export-control administration solicits a host of views and must weigh the effects of its decisions on America's competitive position.

Christopher's aides also noted in their 1995 classified memo that "U.S. firms remain concerned there could be additional sanctions imposed on China precluding future munitions licenses," exactly the kind of sanctions that had been only recently lifted for China Aerospace's subsidiaries.

And there was a lot at stake: an estimated 14 commercial communications satellite launches a year worldwide, costing several hundred million dollars apiece.

"The business community regarded the inclusion of civilian satellites on the munitions list as an insult," said William Reinsch, the under secretary of Commerce for export control, who fought Christopher's decision. "We're the only country that treats them that way."

The Chinese also understood that they had a huge stake in the outcome of the decision. Zuoyi Huang, president of the California subsidiary of China Great Wall, a part of the China Aerospace empire, said in an interview that his company was eager for any changes that would insure easier access to American technology.

"The license takes time," he said. "You have to get a waiver

from the president. The customers can't wait. It's just pure commercial use. It's not a military threat to the United States."

#### The Review: A Decision Against and a Quick Appeal

The arguments came to a head in 1995. C. Michael Armstrong, then the chief executive of Hughes Electronics and newly chosen as the head of Clinton's export council, asked to meet Christopher. He urged that satellites, which his company produces, no longer be treated as military goods.

The secretary of state promised that he would conduct a detailed review in consultation with the Department of Defense, the CIA and National Security Agency, and the Department of Commerce.

But the majority of the interagency group quickly found itself at odds with the aerospace industry. A key issue was how to protect encryption equipment, which is built into a satellite and interprets instructions from ground controllers who manipulate the satellite once it is in orbit. Similar devices are used to communicate with American spy satellites, and the Pentagon and intelligence agencies worried that anyone who could crack the code could take control of the satellites themselves.

An Aug. 17, 1995, a memorandum prepared for the interagency group noted that the chief executive of a satellite company told Christopher that

"once it is embedded in the satellite, the encryption device has no military significance." Thus, the industry argued, there was little risk that the Chinese would get their hands on the encryption devices -- especially because American military officials are supposed to watch the satellites with care when they are in Chinese hands.

But, the memo went on, "the national security position" is that "the nature of the device itself," not its location, "should be used to determine whether it must be controlled as a military item."

The encryption issue was one of the main reasons the interagency group -- over the objections of the Commerce Department -- recommended that satellites remain on the munitions list. Christopher concurred.

Soon after Christopher put his initials on the decision memorandum, Commerce Secretary Ronald Brown appealed the decision to the president.

#### The Turnaround: Commerce Dept. Wins a Turf Battle

The debate surrounding the appeal did not heat up for four months. The nature of the arguments that went to the White House are still unclear: Many of the documents remain classified. But those that have been reviewed by The New York Times show that the White House and the Commerce Department began communicating again about the issue on Feb. 8, 1996, two days after Clinton

broke a backlog of applications for launches by China, by approving four of them that day.

Clinton signed those waivers the same day that Wang Jun, the man who was often referred to during the campaign finance investigations as a "Chinese arms dealer," visited Washington. His company, China International Trade and Investment Corp., has a multibillion-dollar stake in one of Hong Kong's largest satellite companies.

That same day, Wang met with Brown, at his expansive office in the Commerce Department. And that evening, Wang attended a coffee at the White House, an event Clinton later called "clearly inappropriate." Others at the coffee said Wang never spoke during the session.

By mid-February, for reasons that are still murky, there seemed to be some urgency at the White House to decide whether to reverse Christopher's decision, shifting satellite export licensing to the Commerce Department.

A Feb. 15 State Department memo talks about speeding up the process because "the administration wanted to wrap this up."

In the end, the State Department relented. Participants in the final debate said that the president concluded that the technology could be adequately protected through the Commerce Department, just as the department protects supercomputers and other sensitive tech-

nologies.

The president's decision was announced on March 14. Commerce officials, who had just won one of Washington's nastiest turf wars, were jubilant.

"Good news," officials were told by e-mail. The electronic message went on to recommend a "low key" spin on the news that would "not draw attention to the decision."

Internal Commerce Department documents show that officials were anticipating questions from reporters and Congress about whether the decision represented an effort to ease technology transfers to China and remove items from sanctions -- some of the same concerns that figured in Christopher's decision.

In the days preceding the announcement, China had raised tensions with its Asian neighbors and the United States to new heights, firing M-9 ballistic missiles, which carried dummy warheads, into target zones 30 miles off the shore of Taiwan.

The March 14 announcement said that regulations implementing the president's decision would be issued within 30 days. But the bureaucratic infighting continued.

Finally, the State Department issued the regulations shifting most satellite licensing to the Commerce Department.

They were published on Nov. 5, 1996, the day Clinton was re-elected.

San Diego Union-Tribune

May 17, 1998

## Defense To Mark 50 Years Since Military Desegregation

By Scott Shepard  
COX NEWS SERVICE

WASHINGTON -- Fifty years ago, President Harry S. Truman signed an executive order to integrate U.S. military units, an act that not only transformed America's armed forces but presaged the civil rights movement that altered the entire nation.

While African-Americans are still underrepresented at the highest levels of the Pentagon hierarchy, the U.S. military -- and the Army in particular -- is viewed as a model of race relations for society.

With that in mind, the Defense Department is making plans to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Executive Order 9381, issued by Truman on July 26, 1948, officially ending the segregation of blacks serving in the military.

The celebration began this weekend with a speech by Defense Secretary William Cohen at Norfolk State University, one of 103 historically black universities that produce 60 percent of all African-American military officers.

There is much to celebrate, according to sociologists and historians who have studied the

military's success in carrying out Truman's order.

"The Army is the only place in American society where whites are routinely bossed by blacks, so there's a lot American society can learn from the Army," said Charles Moskos, a professor of sociology at Northwestern University and the author of numerous studies of the military, including "All That We Can Be," a 1996 book about racial integration of the Army.

It is not so much that the Army is color-blind, Moskos contends, but that it is "race-savvy." By that he means that

while the Army's commitment to nondiscrimination is absolute, its standards of performance are uncompromising.

John Sibley Butler, a sociologist at the University of Texas in Austin and Moskos' co-author, explained: "The Army has recognized that as the real issue in opportunity, not who likes who."

The Army, the oldest and largest of the armed services and the one most studied by sociologists, is not immune to racial hatred. Its ranks include white racists from the radical fringe, "skinheads" and Ku

Klux Klan members.

"But racism doesn't matter," said Butler. "The absence of white racism is not a precondition of black advancement, whether in the military or in American society. The key, again, is opportunity."

Moskos, who is white, and Butler, who is black, agreed that the Army, even with racists, is a better race relations model for American society than the typical predominantly white university, where there is no overt racism but no black leadership, either.

Brother Edward Sheehy Jr., a history professor at LaSalle University in Philadelphia, agreed that the U.S. military, despite its racial tension, is "still more color-blind than any other institution in American society."

Sheehy, whose father was an Annapolis graduate and career naval officer, said that "at least since the Cold War, the perception has been if a person can do the job, that's all that counts."

Before Executive Order 9381, however, the perception was widespread -- and official -- that African-American soldiers were somehow lacking, despite a proud heritage extending back to the colonial era, when blacks served as militiamen in the Northern colonies.

About 380,000 African-Americans served in World War I and more than 1 million took part in World War II, all in units even more segregated from whites than were blacks in civilian society.

But in the spring of 1948, as Congress prepared to renew the military draft, civil rights leaders A. Philip Randolph and the Rev. Grant Reynolds warned Truman that they would lead a campaign of civil disobedience against the draft if the president did not abolish racial segregation in the Army.

Truman biographer Robert Donovan suggested in his book "Conflict and Crisis" that Truman's civil rights overtures, including desegregation of the military, were in part a political calculation. "He wanted the black vote," Donovan wrote.

Whatever Truman's motives, for a native of the segregated South to issue such an executive order was "important and powerful," said Delia Crutchfield Cook, assistant professor of history at the University of Missouri in Kansas City.

Indeed, Executive Order 9381 came six years before the landmark Brown vs. Board of Education decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, which declared "separate but equal" public facilities for minorities unconstitutional.

It took several years for

Truman's edict to be carried out. The Korean War marked the first time since the Revolutionary War that whites and blacks fought in formally integrated units, though under the command of white officers.

Desegregation of the military came in two phases. In the 1950s, the enlisted ranks began to be filled with African-Americans, and in the late 1970s, the Carter administration set up an affirmative action program to increase the number of senior black officers.

Among those who benefited from that affirmative action program was Colin L. Powell, whose appointment as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest rank in the military hierarchy, marked a milestone for African-Americans.

This year, for the first time in U.S. military history, all three services -- the Army, the Navy and the Air Force -- have African-Americans serving as four-star generals. The Marine Corps, part of the Navy, still has no black four-star general, however.

Despite this progress, the gains are incomplete. Only 8.1 percent of military officers are black, compared to 20 percent of the enlisted ranks, according to the latest Pentagon data.

Nevertheless, the racial integration that began in the 1950s

has spilled over into the civilian sphere, as sociologists Reynolds Farley and William Frey found in a 1994 study based on 1990 census data.

They found that the most racially integrated communities in America were towns with large military installations: Fayetteville (Fort Bragg) and Jacksonville (Camp Lejeune), N.C.; Killeen (Fort Hood), Texas; and Lawton (Fort Sill), Okla.

To many veterans, integration made a difference on a personal level.

Durward Timmons, 81, of Arlington, Va., a white man who was a World War II bomber navigator, recalled the years immediately after Truman's desegregation order.

"At first the black officers were an oddity, but then there was a lot of resentment, especially among the Southern officers," said Timmons, a native of McKinney, Texas, who retired from the Air Force as a lieutenant colonel in 1969.

Timmons acknowledged feeling some resentment himself, but said his feelings were tempered by the fact that some of the famous black "Tuskegee airmen" had flown protection missions for his B-24 bomber flights over Europe.

"That made a big difference in my psyche," said Timmons.

Chicago Tribune

May 17, 1998

## House Unit's Call For Same-Sex Military Training Stirs Battle

By Michael Kilian  
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- Defying the policies of the Clinton administration and the uniformed heads of the military services, the House is moving to end integrated training and housing of men and women recruits in the armed forces.

The mammoth annual defense authorization bill, which the House is expected to vote on this week, would impose a strict prohibition against mixing the sexes during the training phase of military service.

In addition, the House bill would require that female drill instructors be assigned to oversee female recruits and training, female-only barracks be constructed and male servicemen be prohibited from visiting fe-

male barracks after hours.

The controversial measures, which passed the House National Security Committee this month, set the stage not only for a major battle between the House and the Pentagon but also between the House and Senate, which continues to support integrated training, as well as between male and female House Republicans.

The impending clash is expected to serve as a critical turning point for advocates of full equality for women in the military, whose more than 200,000 servicewomen account for 14 percent of the current 1.28 million total force.

As an added irritant to the White House, the House committee also included a provision that would subject civilian members in the military

command--the president, the secretary of defense and the three service secretaries--to the same military sexual-misconduct regulations that govern uniformed personnel.

Adopted at the request of Military Personnel Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Steve Buyer (R-Ind.), the provision ostensibly would make President Clinton liable for his alleged sexual misconduct to the same military judicial process that resulted in the court-martial and demotion of Army Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney and the general discharge of Air Force bomber pilot Lt. Kelly Flinn for offenses related to adultery.

"There is a double standard because the commander in chief has allegedly conducted himself in a manner that would be a court-martial offense for

military personnel for sexual assault and sexual harassment regarding the allegations by the Democrat staffer in the White House, Kathleen Willey," Buyer said.

The Senate version of the defense authorization bill contains no such extension of military sexual-conduct rules to the president.

Further setting the stage for a major fight between the houses of Congress, the Senate Armed Services Committee added to its defense authorization measure an amendment sponsored by Sens. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) and Dirk Kempthorne (R-Idaho) that specifically forbids the military from resegregating its training process by gender.

"Despite the controversy that swirls around this issue, no

study or sample of opinion supports the contention that segregated training improves performance in the field or fleet," said Snowe, who served as a member of the congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues.

"Most independent assessments, including those by the Army Research Institute, the Rand Corp., the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute and the Defense Advisory Commission on Women in the Services reveal that mixed training improves unit performance rates without degrading the skills of male personnel," Snowe said.

The House move to end integrated training is being led by Rep. Roscoe Bartlett (R-

Md.), who has long argued that gender mingling seriously detracts from the effectiveness of training, and Buyer, a former Army officer and Persian Gulf war veteran who recently served as chairman of a House study group appointed to examine the issue.

"Bowling to the altar of political correctness cannot change human nature," Bartlett said. "The sexual dynamic is both an attraction and a distraction that has no place during the intense period of basic training that transforms civilians into military personnel."

Their amendment also carries forth the recommendations of an 11-member panel led by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kan.) that called for same-sex training units and barracks.

Though he appointed the Kassebaum group, Defense Secretary William Cohen largely rejected its findings and adhered to the "fight together, train together" policy.

Cohen's position was backed by individual uniformed service commanders, who argued in House testimony that gender-integrated training was necessary for the military to carry out its mission.

Servicewomen are still barred from direct combat roles but have all other military jobs open to them. These include all Air Force positions; all Navy jobs except for the SEALs and submarine service; and such combat-related Army slots as flying attack helicopters, driving armored vehicles and service as military police in combat

areas.

"The success of our volunteer military requires us to recruit from the widest and most talented pool available," said Rep. Tillie Fowler (R-Fla.), who led an unsuccessful fight against the Bartlett-Buyer measure. "Others presume that the individuals recruited from that pool cannot be trained together. We believe that logic is flawed and that leadership and accountability are the principal keys to resolving sexual harassment and misconduct problems in the military."

According to the bill, an appropriation of \$8 million would cover the additional costs of separate training, though an additional \$635 million was also authorized—\$72 million more than Clinton requested—for new barracks.

## Military ID Cards Stolen From Base

By Neal Thompson  
Sun Staff

Military identification cards and the equipment used to create them have been stolen from the Army's personnel office at Fort Meade, investigators and military sources said yesterday.

The equipment could create bogus cards that would be approved by the gatehouses of military bases around the world. In the past, blank ID cards stolen from military bases have been used in rings that cashed stolen checks at military bases.

The missing equipment includes a mug-shot camera, a box of 200 blank ID cards, a laminating machine and a device that imprints a three-dimensional hologram on the laminated card -- all that's needed to create an ID that could give the user access to unrestricted areas of military installations.

The theft occurred this month at the Army base off the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which is home to the National Security Agency and other, smaller government and Army tenants.

Word of the missing identification cards and equipment

comes on the heels of the recent theft of 50,000 rounds of ammunition from the top-secret NSA. Members of NSA's police force are suspected in that theft.

Sources said the two thefts are not connected.

The Army's Criminal Investigation Command in Washington confirmed yesterday that it is "investigating the recent theft of equipment used to process military identification cards," said Ken Miller, a spokesman for the command, better known as the CID.

Investigators at the base said they could provide no further details. "I'm not at liberty to discuss that," said Lonny Anderson, head of the CID at Fort Meade.

Miller said local law enforcement is assisting the Army in its investigation and that other military bases will be alerted to the thefts.

The FBI said it is not involved in investigating the theft or the missing ammunition, which led to the resignation last week of two members of the NSA's police force.

"We still have no investigation, and we don't anticipate having an investigation," said FBI spokesman Larry Foust.

Word of the missing ID cards and equipment spread to other military installations in the region, including the Naval Academy and Aberdeen Proving Ground, where some officials expressed concern about

military IDs ending up in the wrong hands.

"There's a lot of implications," said a military investigator, who asked not to be identified. "If someone could make their own ID cards, they could obviously access a lot of places they shouldn't."

In the past, the theft of military badges has caused anxiety at installations fearful of unauthorized visitors.

In 1985, a sailor was convicted of trying to sell 575 stolen blank military ID cards to undercover Navy agents for \$500,000. In 1989, 1,400 cards were stolen from a New Jersey Air Force base. In 1991, 187 blank cards and ID-making equipment were stolen from Fort McCoy in Wisconsin.

A bulletin at that time warned of "the great potential for entry on any military instal-

lation in the world for any purpose."

In 1996, a Long Island man with a fake Army ID gained repeated access to an Air National Guard base and persuaded officials to give him a helicopter tour of Long Island.

Stolen military IDs have been used to cash stolen checks or to write bad checks. One of the IDs stolen from Fort McCoy in 1991 was used to write \$30,000 in bad checks.

In 1994, two underage Air Force Academy cadets forged military IDs to gain access to local nightspots.

Fort Meade is offering a \$1,000 reward to anyone with information that could lead to the arrest and conviction of those who stole the equipment from Fort Meade. Investigators ask anyone with information to call the CID office at Fort Meade: 301-677-6872.

Baltimore Sun

May 16, 1998

Pg. 1B

Washington Post

May 17, 1998

Pg. 23

## U.N. Role In Remains' Transfer Protested

SEOUL -- One day after refusing to hand over remains believed to be those of U.S. soldiers, North Korea accused Washington of playing politics over the return of remains.

U.S. military officials representing the American-led U.N. Command waited Friday at the border village of Panmunjom to recover two sets of remains believed to be those of U.S. soldiers killed in the 1950-53 Korean War. But the North Koreans never showed up.

North Korea said it did not hand over the remains because the United States wanted them to be transferred through the U.N. Command rather than taking them over directly.

# A year later, laser still burns fliers

## Pilot grounded, Navy man reassigned as pain continues

Washington  
Times

May 18, 1998

Pg. 8

By Bill Gertz  
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A U.S. Navy intelligence officer and Canadian helicopter pilot are still dealing with eye injuries suffered during an encounter more than a year ago with a Russian freighter that was suspected of spying on a U.S. nuclear submarines.

Navy Lt. Jack Daly said in an interview his eyes still hurt from burns caused by a laser fired from Russian ship *Kapitan Man* as he photographed the ship with a digital camera aboard a Canadian Forces helicopter flying nearby.

"I'm still having considerable pain in the eyes, vision problems, extreme sensitivity to light. Driving at night is hindered," Lt. Daly, 39, said by telephone.

The Canadian pilot, Capt. Pat Barnes, also is suffering from laser burns to his eyes as a result of the encounter with the *Kapitan Man*.

"Sometimes it's a burning sensation, at other times it's the sensation that you get if you eat too much ice cream too fast. Other times it feels like I'm being stuck with a pin in the eyes," Capt. Barnes told the Canadian Press Service.

Both men were examined by U.S. Army doctors in San Antonio last year after the April 4 incident, and were diagnosed as suffering the effects of a pulsing laser.

The Pentagon kept secret the April 4 incident in the Strait of

Juan De Fuca, north of Puget Sound in Washington state until it was disclosed by The Washington Times a year ago.

An investigation was then ordered by Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and it concluded that a laser was fired at the helicopter, but that the origin was unknown. A Pentagon spokesman said the incident was "a mystery."

"As far as Pat and I are concerned, there was only one source — it was that damn ship," Lt. Daly said.

Lt. Daly, who was working as an intelligence liaison officer in Esquimalt, British Columbia, has since been reassigned to San Diego, where he continues to do intelligence work. He would not say if the laser incident harmed his career.

According to a Joint Staff report written shortly after the incident, the *Kapitan Man* was known to the U.S. community as a suspected intelligence gathering ship that carried submarine detection equipment on board.

The report, labeled "top secret," stated that details of the affair were restricted to a few government officials "due to the sensitivity of the incident."

The report stated that the *Kapitan Man* was sailing inbound toward Tacoma, Wash., at about the same time as the USS *Ohio*, a ballistic missile submarine, was passing in outbound.

The Russian ship was searched, and a protest note was filed with the Russian Embassy in Washington, but no laser was found on board. The Pentagon acknowledged that some areas of the ship were not searched.

Capt. Barnes, 42, has been grounded by his injuries. "I'll never fly again," he said.

As a result of the laser injuries, he has developed severe pain in his right eye that requires medication.

"It's like having a toothache all the time," Capt. Barnes told the press service in an interview.

The Canadian unit was engaged in a weeklong reconnaissance operation to follow the *Kapitan Man*, ostensibly a Russian cargo ship based in Vladivostok but widely suspected within the U.S. intelligence community of being an intelligence ship.

On April 4, 1997, the helicopter made several passes over the ship to view its antenna array. Lt. Daly and Capt. Barnes did not experience eye pain until after the helicopter landed at Esquimalt.

The House Intelligence Committee and its ranking Democrat, Rep. Norm Dicks of Washington, launched an investigation into the Pentagon's handling of the affair, but no details of the probe have been made public.

The Pentagon said last year that the injuries to the two men were temporary and that both recovered.

Washington Post

May 18, 1998

Pg. B8

### Navy Helps Falcons to Safer Nest

The news just keeps getting better for two peregrine falcons that last year stood in the way of prospective Navy plans to conduct live-fire exercises on the Chesapeake Bay island where the birds had nested.

This year the birds have produced four eggs; last spring they hatched two eggs.

And this year, thanks to work by the U.S. Navy, the birds are nestled in a new home. Its salient feature: It is not on Adam Island, the birds' erstwhile home, which may someday come under fire as Navy commandos use it for training.

"We figured the birds would be better off in a national wildlife refuge than a bombing range," said John Gill, an officer with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which urged the Navy to move the falcon nesting site.

Adam Island sits in the Bloodsworth Island complex, a longtime Navy bombing range in Maryland's Dorchester County on the Eastern Shore, across the

Chesapeake Bay from St. Mary's County. In recent years, the range has been little used.

Last year the Navy circulated preliminary plans to use Adam Island for live-fire commando exercises that now take place in Puerto Rico. But the Wildlife Service nixed any maneuvers if the lovebird falcons, members of an endangered species, produced offspring—which they did.

After those birds left home late last summer and the nest stood empty, the Navy took down the tower that supported it. In the fall, the service built a new tower and a nesting box on Spring Island, part of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, said Cmdr. Mike Andrews.

"If Fish and Wildlife said it was something we should do, we said, 'Okay, we'll do it,'" said Andrews, a spokesman for the Norfolk command.

He said that plans for the maneuvers had been "on a holding pattern" but that the exercises remained a possibility.

—Todd Shields

New York Times

May 18, 1998

### Hercules Settles Suit By Whistle-Blower

By The Associated Press

SALT LAKE CITY -- Hercules Inc. is settling a decade-old whistle-blower's lawsuit for \$55 million, avoiding trial over allegations that its nuclear rocket inspection system was riddled with flaws.

The settlement was announced by Hercules on Friday.

The ousted rocket inspector, Katherine Colunga, filed her lawsuit after she was dismissed in 1987 when she questioned quality-control inspections for

rocket motors manufactured at the Hercules plants in Clearfield and Magna, Utah.

Ms. Colunga filed the lawsuit in 1989 under the Federal False Claims Act, a statute that allows citizens to sue contractors on behalf of the Government. The Federal Government

had declined to join in her suit.

Ms. Colunga contended that she found poor quality-control inspections during the production of nine missile systems -- including the Trident, Pershing and Titan -- built by Hercules in Utah.

In a statement, the chairman

and chief executive of Hercules, R. Keith Elliott, insisted that the motors met and exceeded Government requirements. He said the company was settling the case to avoid costly and lengthy litigation.

Hercules, based in Wilmington, Del., sold its aerospace

division, including the two plants, to Alliant Techsystems, in 1995.

Hercules said it would pay \$36 million to Ms. Colunga and another \$19 million to cover plaintiff's attorney fees, expenses and costs.

Navy Times

May 25, 1998

Pg. 2

## Navy aims to settle McVeigh case

Navy officials are dangling the possibility of early retirement in front of Timothy McVeigh as a way to end a controversy over his sexual orientation, *Navy Times* has learned.

Though officials wouldn't speak for the record, it was apparent that negotiations are ongoing between the Navy and attorneys for McVeigh, whose career remains in limbo after he was accused of being a homosexual.

With 18 years in service, McVeigh, 36, reportedly is being offered early retirement under rules originally meant to help the military get through the drawdown.

As a skilled submarine technician and one-time chief of the boat in Hawaii, McVeigh normally wouldn't qualify. But early retirement would be one way to end a standoff resulting from a judge's ruling that blocked the Navy from discharging him under the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on homosexuals in uniform.

McVeigh was one of 16 submarine senior chief electronics technicians selected for advancement to master chief May 8. Normally, military people spend at least two years in grade to qualify for retirement at that level. So if McVeigh accepts the Navy's offer, he'd likely retire as a senior chief.

McVeigh has been "frocked" to his new paygrade, but his time in service as a master chief won't start until he actually advances, probably sometime around January.

McVeigh's civilian attorney, Alec Farr, refused May 15 to confirm that McVeigh is negotiating for early retirement. But Farr did say McVeigh's advancement may change the thrust of his legal efforts to force the Navy to reinstate him as a submarine's most senior sailor.

"Not to be permitted to complete his COB tour might have hurt his career," Farr said. But, he added, "we agree with the government that his promotion changes the landscape."

— John Burlage

## INSIDE THE RING

by Ernest Blazar

Washington

Times

May 18, 1998

Pg. 9

### Secret brawl

A recent fight between Senate committees may force the \$26.7 billion U.S. intelligence budget into the open. Well, not all the way, but at least the melee may drive it out of its 50-year-old hiding place in the defense budget.

It all began when the Senate Armed Services Committee took a fistful of money out of this year's mostly secret intelligence authorization bill, which had already cleared its own Senate oversight committee.

Why is one of the Pentagon's oversight committees able to steal money from the spies' budget? Because the intelligence budget is cloaked within the defense budget. Like any racket, this protective cover comes at a price. And when the Senate Armed Services Committee tried to collect payment this year, Sen. John Glenn got mad.

A member of both committees, this former Marine combat pilot charged the Armed Services Committee with "cannibalizing" and making "meat ax" whacks in the intelligence budget.

Consequently, it "should no longer play a role in authorizing intelligence programs, particularly when it appears that it has little appreciation for the vital

role of intelligence in our nation's security," said the Ohio Democrat in written remarks. What really angered Mr. Glenn was that the stolen intelligence money apparently went for pork-barrel items, things the Pentagon doesn't need or want, according to Senate aides.

"I believe the time has come to formally end the practice of burying the intelligence budget in the Pentagon's budget," concluded Mr. Glenn. Apparently shamed by the incident, guilty senators returned some of the pilfered money last Wednesday in a hasty and low-profile Senate floor action.

### One brave soldier

Last Thursday, this column reported that the four top enlisted men from the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps unanimously reject the notion that higher-ranking officers are punished less severely than enlisted folks for crimes.

Well, some who disagree e-mailed Inside the Ring. Army Sgt. Maj. Robert V. Winstead, a 29-year transportation specialist stationed at Fort Belvoir, Va., read what his superiors had to say in this column and called it "the last straw."

"I was completely disgusted by the remarks of those senior enlisted 'leaders.' Are they so politically motivated that they have lost their perception of reality?

"If a lower-ranked soldier stood accused of the same alleged crimes as [former Sergeant Major of the Army Gene C. McKinney and Army Maj. Gen. David Hale — both charged with sexual harassment and offered retirement], they wouldn't stand a chance.

"Sergeant Major of the Army Robert E. Hall, who is supposed to represent the enlisted soldiers, should have expressed his outrage at the handling of the Gen. Hale case. Had this been an enlisted soldier a court martial would have been convened and the individual hung out to dry.

"Army Chief of Staff Gen. Dennis Reimer's statement that he didn't know the severity of the charges against Gen. Hale when he allowed him to retire brings his leadership decision-making process into question. If that truly is the case, he should fire his staff and — in my opinion — follow Gen. Hale.

"To say that we treat everyone the same is pure fantasy. A general or sergeant major who gets a letter of reprimand is usually eligible for retirement. But a more junior-ranked soldier isn't and needs to get promoted in order to stay in the service until eligible for retirement.

"I think you get the picture."

### Clumsy tip-off

There has been much speculation that the United States sowed the seeds for its own intelligence

failure over last week's surprise Indian nuclear blasts.

Former CIA chief R. James Woolsey told Congress last week that the United States likely compromised some American reconnaissance satellite abilities when it confronted India with secret evidence of its 1995 atomic testing plans.

A U.S. intelligence official who asked not to be named confirmed this — somewhat elliptically — to Inside the Ring last week: "It is possible that in how we [informed] the Indians [in 1995], it may have assisted them in knowing what we looked at and how we looked at it and that may have assisted them in their deception of us."

### Pulling rank

There they go again. Fresh from last year's grab for more clout — an unsuccessful bid for a seat on the Joint Chiefs of

Staff — the National Guard is again on the march.

What's on the wish list this year? Congressional protection from troop cuts still being applied to the active force. And the newly introduced Senate bill calls for a one-star upgrade for the three-star National Guard Bureau chief, his two-star deputy and each of the four services' two-star reserve chiefs.

### Oversight, please

The New York Air National Guard F-16 pilots who returned their medals to Congress last week may get a reprieve. An amendment to the House of Representatives' defense bill will be offered this week. It calls for a Pentagon investigation into retaliation against these "boys from Syracuse," as fliers from this squadron were once known. Their careers ended after they flunked what they say was an unqualified

woman who was forced on their squadron for reasons of gender politics.

### Wake-up call

"I think we are facing a period of escalation of weapons of mass destruction [on the Indian sub-continent]. I think we now have a nuclear arms race on our hands, and I think the era of complacency is clearly over about the nuclear threat. And your children are not going to go to bed tonight, I am sorry to say, as safe as some would have you believe."

— Rep. Porter J. Goss of Florida, chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and former CIA case officer, speaking on John McLaughlin's "One on One" television show this weekend.

• Ernest Blazar can be reached at 703/486-3949 and via e-mail: blazar@twtdmail.com

New York Times May 16, 1998 Pg. 7

## Navy Ships Put On Alert For Evacuation

By Philip Shenon

WASHINGTON, May 15 -- More than 10,000 American troops and a flotilla of United States Navy ships now steaming through the South China Sea are ready to help evacuate American citizens from Indonesia if a planned airlift becomes impossible because of the chaos there, Clinton Administration officials said today.

The Defense Department alerted the ships that they might be needed for an evacuation after it became clear there were not enough seats available aboard commercial jets for the thousands of Americans and other foreigners seeking to flee Jakarta, Indonesia's riot-torn capital.

On Thursday, the State Department urged the estimated 6,000 Americans living in Indonesia's two largest cities, Jakarta and Surabaya, to leave the country as soon as possible, citing the worst political violence in Indonesia in decades.

Administration officials said they hoped that most Americans leaving Indonesia could be accommodated aboard

two Boeing 747 jumbo jets flying from Jakarta to Singapore and Thailand beginning Saturday.

But they said that the United States was ready to use troops, military helicopters and Navy ships if the turmoil shut down airports in Jakarta.

Three American amphibious ships, helicopters and 10,600 troops are expected to participate early next week in long-scheduled military exercises in nearby Thailand, and the Navy ships were reported today to be en route to Thailand in the South China Sea, near Indonesia.

The Administration continued its calls today for political reform in Indonesia, which has been under the iron rule of President Suharto since the mid-1960's, and defended the International Monetary Fund from criticism that the rigorous package of economic reforms demanded by the fund in recent months had helped spark this week's violence, in which more than 200 people had been killed.

"We do not believe that the I.M.F. program is the source of Indonesia's troubles," said James P. Rubin, the State Department spokesman. "We continue to believe that a key component in restoring economic growth in Indonesia will be a vigorous program of eco-

nomics reform as proposed by the I.M.F."

A spokeswoman for the I.M.F. at its headquarters in Washington would not comment when asked whether the fund intended to go forward with its multibillion-dollar rescue package for Indonesia, in light of this week's violence.

"That's not something I can give you any guidance on right now," said the spokeswoman, who under I.M.F. rules agreed to be interviewed on condition that she not be identified by name. "The I.M.F. is monitoring the developments in Indonesia very closely and clearly hopes that all sides will exercise restraint."

She said that the fund believed that its reform plan for Indonesia remained "very much appropriate for Indonesia's economic situation and for restoring confidence and for bringing about a resumption of economic growth."

Still, if there was confidence at the I.M.F. about Indonesia's future, it was not in evidence today at the fund's office in Jakarta, which was shut after the entire local staff was evacuated out of the country.

The World Bank, which is

also participating in the Western-led rescue plan, said it had chartered a plane to evacuate its international staff from Jakarta, although the office director and a handful of senior managers planned to stay in the country.

"We want to insure the safety of everyone who works there and their families," said Graham Barrett, a World Bank spokesman.

Clinton Administration officials said they still planned to send an American military delegation led by Adm. Joseph W. Prueher, the commander of American forces in the Pacific, to Indonesia to urge military leaders to use restraint in dealing with anti-Government demonstrators.

The mission was canceled at the last minute on Thursday because of concern that the violence in the streets of Jakarta made it impossible to guarantee Admiral Prueher's safety in the city.

"Our diplomats are obviously pressing the Indonesians for restraint," said a White House official. "But in a crisis like this, the generals in Indonesia are more likely to listen to somebody else in uniform."

Washington Post May 18, 1998 Pg. B3

## At Andrews Air Show, Flights of Fancy

About 400,000 people examined military materiel and gazed skyward at an air show at Andrews Air Force Base yesterday at the Department of Defense's annual event, which has become the

biggest military show on the East Coast. Total attendance during the three-day open house was estimated at 750,000.

Yesterday's spectacles included a mass airdrop of the 82nd Airborne and performances by the Golden Knights and the Navy's Blue Angels flight teams.

Wall Street Journal May 18, 1998 Pg. 24

## India's Nuclear Tests Mire Clinton In International And Domestic Mess

By Brian Duffy and Robert S. Greenberger, Staff Reporters of the Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON -- Suddenly, the politics of proliferation have gotten very messy. India's surprise nuclear tests, coming at a time when the world appeared to be putting the nuclear genie back in the bottle, raise the specter of a scramble among other nations looking to acquire new nukes. And the tests thrust a grave challenge on President Clinton and his foreign-policy team at a time when they are wrestling with a range of other vexing international problems.

Complicating matters are explosive charges concerning Mr. Clinton's ties to a key nuclear proliferator, China. Fund-raiser Johnny Chung has told the Justice Department that he channeled tens of thousands of dollars from a Chinese military officer to the Democratic Party during President Clinton's reelection campaign. And the Justice Department has now expanded its inquiry of campaign fund raising to determine whether a Clinton administration decision to waive export controls on commercial-satellite technology might have been influenced by such contributions.

Senior administration officials deny any such connection, saying the approval of the satellite exports was based on "competitiveness" issues. Mr. Chung's disclosures were first reported in the New York Times.

The most immediate test for U.S. nonproliferation policy is whether Pakistan can be persuaded not to counter rival India's explosions with one of its own, or with a provocative missile launch. Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub said in an interview with The Wall Street Journal: "We have decided to do the test ... But no date has

been fixed." Other Pakistani officials, however, continue to deny that a decision to test has been made.

Beyond Pakistan, there are the other nuclear wannabes, including Iran and Iraq. "I can see them asking themselves ... 'Why shouldn't we see the value of these weapons for our own security?'" says Lynn Davis, until recently an undersecretary of state for international security.

To prevent a nuclear arms race, Mr. Clinton won't only have to pressure countries that have the potential to build nuclear arsenals, but also try to make sure past suppliers like Russia and China keep their technology under lock and key.

The Chinese connection, which ties the campaign fund-raising scandal to nuclear-proliferation policy, could prove particularly dicey. Exactly where Mr. Chung's allegations will lead is unclear. Administration and Democratic officials say they had no knowledge of the origin of Mr. Chung's funds. Moreover, the money was donated months after Mr. Clinton approved the satellite waiver.

But the Justice Department inquiry goes beyond the Chung allegations. Prosecutors also are examining Mr. Clinton's 1996 decision to approve an export waiver for Loral Space & Communications Ltd. Loral's chief executive, Bernard Schwartz, was the largest contributor to Democrats in 1996, giving \$632,000 in "soft money." Mr. Schwartz and Loral have denied wrongdoing.

Mr. Clinton is scheduled to travel to Beijing late next month, and government officials said he would carry a strong message about the dangers of proliferation of both nuclear and ballistic-missile technology.

Last week's detonations in India's Rajasthan desert under-

score the importance of such a message. Privately, U.S. officials said they believe India was provoked, at least in part, by Beijing's sale of missile technology to Pakistan. That technology enabled Pakistani scientists to significantly extend the delivery range of its longest-range missile, allowing it to reach New Delhi. U.S. officials said China has "curtailed" such sales but that the sales may not have ended completely.

As for Pakistan, White House officials say the nation has given "no assurances" it won't test nuclear weapons. The Pakistani government has made it clear to U.S. diplomats that they are gauging how tough Washington and the rest of the world will be on India.

Attending the summit of leaders of the industrialized nations in Birmingham, England, President Clinton suggested that India's punishment could play a major role in determining what Pakistan does. "The firmer we are here, the more likely we are to be able to persuade Pakistan and perhaps other countries lining up behind Pakistan that they should not test, that they should not try to become public members of the nuclear club," Mr. Clinton said.

One inducement Washington could offer Pakistan is a move to resolve the sale of 28 F-16 fighter-bombers it purchased from the U.S. in the 1980s; Congress froze delivery of the aircraft because members were concerned about Islamabad's ability to deliver nuclear weapons. Although proliferation specialists widely object to rewarding states for not testing, some important members of Congress have suggested they would be willing to release the jets or repay the money Pakistan paid for them if Pakistan refrained from a nuclear test.

Mr. Clinton told reporters in Birmingham that the question of testing "is still being debated" by the Pakistani cabinet and that he was hopeful "they will not go through with the nuclear test."

But it isn't at all clear that will happen. U.S. intelligence agencies, which provided no advance warning of the India blasts, issued a blizzard of in-

formation over the weekend about preparations for a Pakistani test.

Senior U.S. officials fear such a test could ignite a nuclear arms race in South Asia and beyond. The nightmare scenario arises not so much from a Pakistani response to India, but from reaction by China. India has made clear that it perceives Beijing as a strategic threat. If New Delhi continues testing and developing its nuclear arsenal, China, which belongs to several non-proliferation accords, may feel it has no choice but to resume testing.

In some ways, the India-Pakistan confrontation is the thorniest proliferation problem Washington has had to deal with. The U.S. has countered the proliferation threat from Iran and other less-developed rogue states, by convincing their suppliers -- mainly Russia and China -- to stop cooperating. Although there still is leakage of technology and material, these efforts have borne fruit.

In addition, the U.S. has successfully convinced other second-tier nuclear nations that have the technical ability to develop nuclear weapons to refrain from doing so. For instance, when countries such as Argentina and Brazil emerged from military dictatorships in the past decade to become democracies, modernization and trade suddenly became more important than developing nuclear arsenals. As a result, it was comparatively simple to use a combination of carrots and sticks to convince them to avoid a nuclear weapons program.

India and Pakistan are different. They have strong political and security interests in having nuclear weapons, and their nuclear competition is a deadly zero-sum game. Jaw-boning hasn't yielded results, especially since some European nations are unlikely to join the U.S. in imposing sanctions. "Some of our friends sniff great business opportunities here," a U.S. official says.

There may be some hope, however, and oddly enough, it may be in New Delhi. "Pakistan is like the little brother. It has to do whatever India does," says Gary Milhol-

lin, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control. "Even if Pakistan tests, and then India decides to end its nuclear-weapons development, Pakistan will follow."

--Michael K. Frisby in Birmingham, England contributed to this article.

## U.S. Senators Pump Up National Guard Profile

The chief of the National Guard Bureau would be elevated to a four-star general, and the secretary of defense would be required to report to Congress on a force structure appropriate for the National Guard and Reserves under a plan to raise the profile of U.S. reserve forces. Sens. Wendell Ford, D-Ky., and Christopher Bond, R-Mo., plan to do so by introducing the National Guard and Reserve Components Equity Act of 1998.

## Australia Helps U.S. Keep Tabs on Indonesia

U.S. military officials are looking to Australia for insight into Indonesian military affairs, in embarrassed recognition of their lack of access and influence in Jakarta. U.S. officials at Pacific Command headquarters in Honolulu maintain daily contact with Australian military counterparts; otherwise, according to a U.S. defense source, "We wouldn't know a whole lot about events over there... aside from what we see on CNN."

New York Times

May 16, 1998 Pg. 5

## Scooped On Tests, U.S. Scorns A Sikh Journal

By Elaine Sciolino

WASHINGTON, May 15 -- The Central Intelligence Agency may have missed India's preparations for its nuclear tests this week, but a tiny weekly newsletter by a Sikh separatist group did not.

In its issue dated May 7, three days before the explosions, Charhdi Kala International (circulation 9,500; published in Surrey, British Columbia) predicted that plans were well under way.

"Preparations for an Indian nuclear test has been further confirmed by our sources in India (who so far have never been wrong having millions of pairs of eyes and ears fixed to the ground) who report all kinds of feverish nighttime activities in the vicinity of Pokharan in Rajasthan state 60 miles from the Pakistan border," the last paragraph of the main article read.

"The question is will the United States allow the fascists in Delhi to circumvent the U.S. non-proliferation laws? Only time will tell!"

The Pakistani Embassy in Washington did not receive the newsletter until after the Indians had conducted their first round of tests last Monday.

But when Ambassador Riaz H. Khokhar of Pakistan called on Karl F. Inderfurth, the Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, on

Wednesday, to officially protest the explosions as a threat to Pakistan, the Ambassador brought along a copy of the newsletter.

The purpose, Pakistani officials said, was to ask why the United States, with all its spy satellites and human intelligence operatives, had failed to predict the tests, when a small newsletter's sources had got it right. Mr. Inderfurth was stunned.

The State Department, which does not receive the newsletter, called it irresponsible.

"We find it basically to be a rag, full of inaccuracies, quite

tendentious," said one State Department official. "It has a very big ax to grind."

This time, the official added, "it got lucky."

Another official confirmed that Ambassador Khokhar had raised the issue of the news report, but said it was only jokingly, at the end of the meeting.

"He decided apparently to poke fun at the inability of the U.S. intelligence community to predict the Indian test," the official said. "In a clearly light-hearted mode, he showed us the paper, smiling and joking about it."

Pakistani officials, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said it was no joking matter.

The C.I.A. has asked David E. Jeremiah, a retired admiral and former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to investigate the intelligence failure. It declined to comment today, citing the investigation.

But an intelligence official said: "There are literally thousands of publications, including newsletters, that come to the C.I.A. and other intelligence agencies. I don't know at this time whether anyone from the intelligence community gets or take this newsletter seriously."

## Five Decades of Tension

■ **1947:** India and Pakistan created upon independence of British India.

■ **1948:** India and Pakistan wage war over Himalayan province of Kashmir.

■ **1962:** India and China fight border war in Himalayas.

■ **1965:** India and Pakistan again go to war over Kashmir.

■ **1971:** India and Pakistan go to war over Bangladesh (East Pakistan).

■ **1974:** India conducts nuclear-weapons test.

■ **1990:** U.S. cuts aid to Pakistan after it concludes Islamabad is building a nuclear bomb.

■ **1993:** India and China agree to maintain peace on disputed border.

■ **1996:** India and China agree to troop reductions along border, open military contacts.

■ **1998 March:** Hindu nationalist BJP gains power in India, on platform that includes declaring India a nuclear power.

■ **1998 April:**  
--Pakistan announces testing of Ghauri missile, with 937-mile range.  
--Indian defense minister accuses China of providing missile technology to Pakistan; says Indian Prithvi missile can reach

anywhere in Pakistan.

--New York Times reports that Russia is helping India build a sea-launched missile; Russia denies it. Wall Street Journal May 18, 1998 Pg. 14

■ **1998 May**

--Indian defense minister calls China the No. 1 threat to India.

--Pakistani foreign minister claims Pakistan has "over-taken" India in the "missile race."

--Indian defense minister accuses China of stockpiling nuclear weapons, extending airfields in Tibet, and training Myanmar's army.

--India detonates five nuclear devices underground.

### CURRENT NEWS SERVICE

ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500

Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski

NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus

EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)